

COMMITTEE ON
UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

April 5, 1959

ANNUAL REPORT
FOR THE YEAR 1959



February 8, 1960
(Original Release Date)

FEBRUARY 8, 1960.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1960

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword.....	1
Chapter I. Where Does the Communist Party Stand Today?.....	5
Chapter II. Hearings:	
The Kremlin's Espionage and Terror Organizations.....	20
Testimony of Petr S. Deriabin.....	
California.....	22
Pittsburgh, Pa.....	26
Communist Infiltration of Vital Industries, Chicago, Ill.....	37
Passport Security.....	43
American National Exhibition in Moscow.....	53
Communist Training Operations.....	56
Testimony of Clinton Edward Jencks.....	64
Arnold Johnson, Legislative Director of the Communist Party, U.S.A.....	66
Communist Activities Among Puerto Ricans.....	67
Chapter III. Reports:	
Legal Subversion.....	73
Southern California District of the Communist Party.....	76
Who Are They? (Karl Marx).....	79
Communist Lobbying Activities in the Nation's Capital.....	80
The Communist Parcel Operation.....	84
Facts on Communism.....	86
Chapter IV. Consultations:	
Language as a Communist Weapon.....	90
Dr. Stefan T. Possony.....	
Communist Persecution of Churches in Red China and Northern Korea.....	93
Rev. Peter Chu Pong.....	
Rev. Shih-ping Wang.....	
Rev. Tsin-tsai Liu.....	
Rev. Samuel W. S. Cheng.....	
Mr. Kyung Rai Kim.....	
Control of the Arts in the Communist Empire.....	98
Ivan P. Bahriany.....	
The Crimes of Khrushchev (Part 1).....	101
Eugene Lyons.....	
The Crimes of Khrushchev (Part 2).....	106
Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky.....	
Mr. Constantin Kononenko.....	
Mr. Petro Pavlovych.....	
Mr. Mykola Lebed.....	
Prof. Dr. Ivan M. Malinin.....	
Dr. Gregory Kostiuik.....	
Mr. Nicholas Prychodko.....	
Mr. Jurij Lawrynenko.....	
The Crimes of Khrushchev (Part 3).....	110
General Bela Kiraly.....	
Mr. Joseph Kovago.....	
The Crimes of Khrushchev (Part 4).....	114
Dr. Vilis Masens.....	
Mr. Vaclovas Sidzikauskas.....	
Chapter V. Publications.....	117
Chapter VI. Reference Service.....	121
Chapter VII. Contempt Proceedings.....	122
Chapter VIII. Legislative Recommendations.....	129
Index.....	i

PUBLIC LAW 601, 79TH CONGRESS

The legislation under which the House Committee on Un-American Activities operates is Public Law 601, 79th Congress [1946], chapter 753, 2d session, which provides:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, * * **

PART 2—RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

RULE X

SEC. 121. STANDING COMMITTEES

* * * * *

18. Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members.

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

(q) (1) Committee on Un-American Activities.

(A) Un-American activities.

(2) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (i) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (ii) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (iii) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

* * * * *

RULE XII

LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT BY STANDING COMMITTEES

SEC. 136. To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the Congress by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

RULES ADOPTED BY THE 86TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 7, January 7, 1959

* * * * *

RULE X

STANDING COMMITTEES

1. There shall be elected by the House, at the commencement of each Congress,

* * * * *

(q) Committee on Un-American Activities, to consist of nine Members

* * * * *

RULE XI

POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

* * * * *

18. Committee on Un-American Activities.

(a) Un-American activities.

(b) The Committee on Un-American Activities, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make from time to time investigations of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The Committee on Un-American Activities shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of any such investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of any such investigation, the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

* * * * *

26. To assist the House in appraising the administration of the laws and in developing such amendments or related legislation as it may deem necessary, each standing committee of the House shall exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws, the subject matter of which is within the jurisdiction of such committee; and, for that purpose, shall study all pertinent reports and data submitted to the House by the agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

FOREWORD

It is only necessary to thumb through a major newspaper for a few days to perceive the grim realities of the enormous threat this Nation faces today—the global, many-faceted menace of communism.

We read of Red-fomented riots in one country, of Soviet espionage in another—and of a “friendly” Communist trade delegation visiting still another nation, while a Soviet ballet group entertains in a neighboring state; of a Soviet disruptive move in the United Nations, a Red-initiated and directed civil war in one area of the world, a Communist invasion of a newly independent state—and of a top Soviet official visiting some capital and talking “peace and friendship.” We read of Communist persecution of religion one day—and of exchanges of moving pictures and other “cultural” media to encourage “better understanding” the next. We learn of international meetings of representatives of free nations called to discuss means of meeting the Soviet challenge—and of gatherings of Communist representatives plotting how to render these efforts null and void and bring about the destruction of still more free governments.

We learn that in this struggle with the forces of communism the United States is the major target of the enemy and also the major support of those nations which are still free and fighting to preserve their liberty. We learn not only that communism is a matter of grave concern, but that it is a tremendous financial burden to the American people. We are spending over \$40 billion this year for military defense. Hundreds of thousands of young men are postponing the completion of their education or their engagement in productive work to take military training. Each year the Government spends many hundreds of millions of dollars for information and intelligence operations in all quarters of the globe.

For over a decade—and for the first time in our history—American troops in large numbers have been stationed more or less permanently in numerous foreign countries. Our most powerful bombers are constantly in the air on a kind of perpetual defense assignment. Though technically there is no war, the United States is shipping millions of dollars worth of arms each year to other nations which have asked for them, lest they find themselves incapable of resisting Communist aggression and thus lose their freedom.

Under such conditions, simple logic tells us that never before has there been such urgent need for the widest possible understanding of communism—the enemy—in the Congress and at the crossroads of America.

During the past summer a 2-week National Strategy Seminar for 200 carefully selected reserve officers from all over the Nation was held at the National War College in Washington with the endorsement of the Department of Defense and with the assistance of the Reserve Officers Association, the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, and the Institute for American Strategy.

The officers who attended this seminar did not study military science. They did not listen to lectures on military strategy, tactics, weapons development, and other subjects usually associated with the Armed Forces. Rather, the major theme of this seminar, at which a score of the country's top authorities on communism lectured, was "fourth dimensional warfare" or, as it is sometimes called, "political warfare"—combat aimed at destroying an enemy by nonmilitary means. This is a combat science which has been developed by the Communists to its highest degree in the history of civilization.

An implication of this seminar—and a point previously made by many experts—is that this country could be conquered by Communists without a shot being fired; that the military know-how and capabilities of our Armed Forces, our tremendous array of weapons, and the huge sums spent to develop them might never be used in a final defense effort to prevent the enslavement of the American people.

Fantastic? But communism has taken over more than one nation "peacefully," without war or revolution in the usual sense of these words. It has accomplished this by a combination of internal subversion, political and propaganda warfare, economic warfare, and other techniques of "fourth dimensional warfare" which the leaders of world communism have devised for undermining and destroying the governments of free men.

Without in any way underrating the vital importance of massive military strength in being, it can be said that thorough understanding of communism, its doctrines, designs, strategy, and techniques is today the most urgent need of the free world.

In this struggle between freedom and the forces of slavery, the Congress of the United States has charged the Committee on Un-American Activities with the responsibility for maintaining continuing surveillance over the agitational and propaganda activities, within this Nation, of the international Communist conspiracy. It has also charged it with continually reviewing the administration and operation of our security laws for the purpose of recommending such revisions as are necessary to cope with the ever-changing Communist threat.

During the past year the committee has held 11 major hearings, encompassing the testimony of 166 witnesses and covering such diverse subjects as Communist training operations; U.S. passport security; the organization, tactics, and leadership of the Communist Party in California; communism in Puerto Rico; and Soviet espionage operations. In addition, the committee has published, after careful research and study, six reports on various facets of Communist activities—ranging from Communist lobbying in the Nation's Capital and the role of the lawyer in the Communist conspiracy to the gift parcel operations of the Soviet bloc in the United States, and the first volume of a series entitled "Facts on Communism" which will give a complete survey of communism in both its theoretical and practical aspects.

The committee has also published seven consultations with outstanding authorities on various facets of communism. These consultations have dealt with such topics as Communist use of language as a weapon, the control of arts in the Communist empire, the crimes of Khrushchev, and Communist persecution of religion in Red China and North Korea. In discharge of its legislative functions, the committee has recommended legislation relating to nine different subjects.

Defense weapons cost huge sums today—a nuclear submarine \$49 million, an attack carrier \$280 million, a guided-missile destroyer \$34 million. The B-52 bomber at one stage in its development was considered an \$8 million plane. A single Titan missile costs \$2 million. The Air Force recently deactivated four squadrons of F-104 Starfighter interceptors because that model is now outmoded. Each one of these planes had cost \$1.4 million.

The committee operated last year—and made its contribution to our defense effort in the vital field of information and legislation—on a budget of \$327,000, a small fraction of the cost of any major weapon in our military arsenal.

Realizing how vital knowledge of communism is today to all free men—and how important factual information on this subject will be to the final outcome of the struggle in which we are now engaged—it is with pleasure that there is presented to the Congress and the people of this country the Annual Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities for 1959.

FRANCIS E. WALTER, *Chairman.*



ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE YEAR 1959

CHAPTER I

WHERE DOES THE COMMUNIST PARTY STAND TODAY?

The U.S. Communist Party is today convinced that it stands on the threshold of a new era, an era of growth, of increased membership and influence in the United States. It believes that it has successfully fought its way through a period of great hardship and that its most difficult days are a thing of the past.

The Communist Party celebrated its fortieth anniversary in September 1959. Speaking at a rally in Chicago in honor of this occasion, Gus Hall, who was later elected leader of the party at its Seventeenth National Convention in December 1959, made the following exultant statement:

Comrades, in this exciting era, it's great to be alive—but to be alive and a Communist is just tremendous—it is the most.¹

In preparation for the party convention in December, a draft political resolution was drawn up earlier in the year. This document, prepared according to the party's constitution at least 90 days prior to the convention for study by party officials, committees, and members, is an analysis, from the Marxist-Leninist viewpoint, of the situation in which the party finds itself and a statement on the strategy, tactics, and the propaganda line it is to use in the immediate future to accomplish its goals.

The last paragraph of this resolution emphasized the conspiracy's optimism concerning its fortunes in the years immediately ahead:

The decade of the sixties is a period in which the American people will take great strides forward. And it is a period in which our Party and its influence can grow many times over, in which it can become a mass party of the American working class * * *.

Gus Hall delivered the keynote speech at the 1959 convention of the Communist Party. He pointed out the difficult times through which the party had passed, but his major note was one of confidence:

This is a convention which ends all holding operations and sets our sights to the future. It is a convention of advance, of progress * * *.

And it is being held at a time when the decline in our own ranks has been halted, when the morale and fighting spirit of our membership is on the upgrade * * *.

Our Party has traveled a difficult path—and this not only since the 16th Convention. The enemy has thrown wave after wave, both internally and externally, against us now for 10 years. We can say with just pride that the Commu-

¹ The Worker, Oct. 4, 1959, p. 4.

nist Party of the U.S.A. has come through the fires battered but intact. We have suffered defeats but in an overall sense we have matured, become steeled and tempered * * *.

Possibly it was unavoidable, but the fact is that we have now gone through a period that could be called a "holding operation," an operation to stop the decline and deterioration of our Party. I think it is realistic to say that we can now end all such concepts. We are no longer a holding operation but a live, growing organization. Many districts have already demonstrated their ability to move and grow, but this must now become a general rule for the whole Party. In short, both the objective and subjective conditions are now ripe for our Party to move into a position of becoming a serious factor in the life of our nation, in the work of the trade unions, the Negro people, the youth, the farmers and other sections of the population * * *.

He concluded his speech with the following words:

This is a convention of a united party—of a party that is going places.

The present membership of the Communist Party is relatively small compared to what it has been in the past, as this committee has previously pointed out—and as the party's leaders now admit. In addition, the party has been torn by internal strife in recent years—as it also admits today. Why, then, should it be so optimistic about the future?

There are two major reasons.

Soviet Power

The first is the increased power of the Soviet Union—the power being in this case both its military might and its alleged tremendous economic progress.

In an article celebrating the party's fortieth anniversary, which was published in Political Affairs for October 1959 and entitled "The Life of the Party Begins at Forty," Hall repeatedly referred to the Soviet Union's growing strength:

Through a government apparatus at its service, U.S. imperialism reached the position of top dog in the capitalist world, a point where it owned and controlled one-half of the world's industrial production, a point where no serious challenge was forthcoming from any quarter. In large measure it sets its own terms on a take-or-leave-it basis * * *.

Now, with this fortieth anniversary, the curtain is slowly descending on this era. As after an extended orgy—a forty-year binge—the lights are beginning to dim. The era of no serious challenge, of unrestrained and unending expansion, is coming to an end. The top dog is being replaced by a new set of actors * * *.

During these same forty-some years a new economic and social system has made its appearance—the system of Socialism * * *.

Now, after some forty years, it stands as one of the world's two great economic, political, and military powers. * * *

* * * From now on, more than anything else, developments in the world will be shaped by the process and the result of the competition between these two world systems—socialism and capitalism.

The party's draft resolution for its 1959 convention made the following statements on this same theme:

On a world scale, the leading position of the United States, long uncontested, is now being increasingly challenged on all sides by * * * the socialist [Communist] world, which now bids to surpass the achievements of American capitalism in every respect. * * *

Above all, the relationship of forces on a world scale has changed irrevocably in favor of the camp of peace, freedom and social progress. Socialism [communism] has emerged as an invincible world system.

Hall, in his convention speech, said:

* * * This is the first convention to take place in the era when the socialist forces of the world have attained dominance, and when the world peace forces, for the first time in history, are the most powerful voice and movement on the world scene. * * *

The outstanding world phenomenon of today is the fact that the balance of strength is tipping decidedly in the direction of the socialist world. This is a development of profound importance to every capitalist country, but its impact on the leading capitalist stronghold, the bastion of world capitalism, is a virtually explosive one.

At first glance, the might of the Soviet Union, real or alleged, does not seem to have great relevance to the opportunities of the Communist Party to increase its membership and influence in this country. Power in another, however, affects people in different ways. In some it begets fear and then appeasement or fawning cooperation. In others it evokes admiration, even if the power happens to be evil and dangerous. Many people tend to climb on the bandwagon of a successful cause. They will do this for selfish interests, even if they know the cause is evil. Power also begets respect in some persons who, for a variety of reasons, refuse to see the danger and evil in the entity which wields it.

The Communist Party is convinced that Soviet power is already affecting the foreign policy of the United States—in the direction of a softening. It believes that as this power grows, it can also affect the attitude of the United States Government toward the party itself—that there may be a lessening of opposition, exposure, and prosecution of Communists, based on fear of offending Moscow.

The party also attaches great importance to the reputed economic gains the Soviet Union has made in recent years and the even greater advances that it claims will result from its current 7-year plan. These gains, the Communists believe, will impress many Americans and give communism a prestige as an economic system and ideology that it has not succeeded in winning in the past.

Khrushchev's Visit to the United States

The second major reason for the Communist Party's optimism is Khrushchev's recent visit to the United States. Not only U.S. Communist Party publications, but Communist organs in all parts of the world, have hailed this as a tremendous victory. The Communists see Khrushchev's visit as a major break in U.S. foreign policy, dictated largely by the growth of Soviet power. They also believe, however, that his visit, on its own, has had a powerful impact on the American public.

Gus Hall, in his convention speech, referred to the Soviet premier's visit to the United States as an "historic" event, which had "momentous consequences." The party's draft political resolution for its 1959 convention referred to it as "a truly momentous advance in the fight for peaceful coexistence."

The first draft of this resolution was prepared by the National Executive Committee and submitted to, and approved by, the National Committee of the Communist Party at a meeting in New York City on July 25 and 26, 1959—before Premier Khrushchev's visit to the United States in September. It was then published for study and debate by all party members in the September issue of Political Affairs.

Normally, the Communist Party's draft political resolution receives no more than routine discussion in the Communist press from the time of its publication until it is adopted at the convention, either as published or with some revisions. But an unusual development took place in regard to the draft resolution for the 1959 convention.

On November 1, the National Executive Committee of the Communist Party addressed an open letter to the party membership, stating that since the draft resolution had been prepared "many important events have occurred" which have made clearer "certain highly significant developments which were not so clearly discernible" when the resolution was drafted. These developments, the National Executive Committee said, made it "necessary to add to the draft and to modify some points in it."²

What were the significant developments that had taken place?

"The most striking of these developments," the National Executive Committee said in its letter to all party members, "is the Khrushchev visit and its consequences." His visit and the scheduled return visit of President Eisenhower, the letter went on, were the outgrowth of a "growing world trend toward peaceful co-existence" and of tendencies toward a change in U.S. foreign policy produced by "a change in the relationship of forces on a world scale, with a mounting challenge to the dominant position of American capitalism * * *."

The letter continued:

The Khrushchev visit has produced certain immediate effects of great import to the American people * * *. It not only opens the door to certain immediate gains * * * but creates new opportunities for the peace forces [the Communists] to impose further shifts in foreign policy * * *.

* * * the forces of peace now fight from a greatly improved vantage point * * * tremendous new opportunities now exist to advance the cause of peace—if they are grasped.

² The Worker, Nov. 1, 1959, p. 5.

In particular, attention must be focused on the issue of disarmament * * *.

The letter went on to explain how huge sums of money would be available for various welfare measures if the United States had a peace-time economy. It said that the Communist Party must take the lead in this fight and in the "fight for an end to the cold war." It was clear, the statement continued, that in the 1960 elections "peace will be the dominant issue." This important fact and a growing anti-labor trend "must be taken more adequately into account in the draft resolution."

The following paragraphs in the letter indicate the tremendous significance attached to Khrushchev's visit to the United States by the Communist Party:

It is our responsibility, too, to bring forward the fight for socialism in the light of the new situation which exists. For the American people are changing their attitude toward socialism. The Sputniks and Luniks, the economic advance and challenge of the Soviet Union, its impressive educational achievements—these and other developments have produced more than mere curiosity in this country.

Americans are examining and weighing the relative merits of the two systems. And they are coming more and more to realize that the socialist achievements offer no threat to them. Hence the lucid descriptions of the Soviet society presented by Khrushchev fell on interested ears.

To these responsibilities, our Party has already begun to respond. In a number of places, we already witness significant new signs of breaking our isolation and becoming involved as a significant factor in the mass movements. And the present objective conditions offer real possibilities for expanding this trend.

Of paramount importance in our work is the elevation of the cause of peace and disarmament to the place of first rank which it deserves. In this, we must not underestimate the changes which have taken place. * * *

The initiative taken by President Eisenhower for the exchange of visits, the extraordinary tour of Premier Khrushchev in our country, the memorable talks at Camp David, Khrushchev's historic bid before the United Nations to join in a four-year plan to effect total disarmament—such events have inspired the people of our country and the whole world with the highest hopes for peace and with the vision of a world of good-neighborly relations in which countries with different social systems coexist in peaceful and productive competition for the enrichment of the life of all mankind.

Exchange visits of heads of state are quite common today. It is, therefore, rather difficult to see why the Communist Party should believe that Khrushchev's visit to the United States should have such tremendous importance—other than as the previously mentioned indication of a change in U.S. foreign policy. Won't his visit be largely forgotten in a relatively short time, just as the visits of other heads of state have been?

Analysis of the above-quoted Communist documents and statements indicates that the party believes Khrushchev's visit will have lasting impact because he succeeded in influencing a significant number of Americans to believe that he can be trusted when he speaks of his desire for peaceful coexistence with this country; that he was telling the truth, for example, when he explained that by his threat to "bury" the United States he merely meant that communism would succeed capitalism—as capitalism succeeded feudalism—through superior economic and social performance in fulfilling the needs and desires of the people.

Moreover, Khrushchev—unlike other heads of state—has a huge international propaganda machine and also an agency in this country (the Communist Party) which will see that the impact of his visit is not lost. These agencies will continue to bombard the American people with the same slogans, words, and thoughts that he used and, by the process of repetition alone, will succeed in obtaining a certain acceptance of them.

Thus the Communist Party's belief that it has today an opportunity to "grow many times over" and to become "a mass party of the American working class." The Communists are basing their conviction largely on the trusting nature of the American people, on their strong tendency to take a man—even a Communist—at his word. This, they believe, will enable them and also the leaders of the world Communist conspiracy to mislead the American people as to the true nature and aims of Moscow and of the U.S. Communist Party.

The committee believes, therefore, that the security of this Nation depends in large measure upon the degree to which the American public, its elected officials, and policymakers know how to interpret Communist statements. If they take the words of Communists at face value, the results could be disastrous. But if they know how to interpret them correctly, neither Khrushchev nor the Communist Party will be able to deceive them. They will understand the Communists' true designs and take the steps required to defeat them.

What Do Communists' Words Mean?

After completing his U.S. tour, Soviet Premier Khrushchev visited Red China. On October 4, 1959, he wound up his 5-day visit to that country with a speech in Peking, in the course of which he said:

* * * we Communists of the Soviet Union consider it as our sacred duty, our primary task * * * to liquidate the cold war, and guarantee the triumph of the cause of peace on earth.

On several occasions after Khrushchev left Red China and before he delivered a major address to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on October 31, 1959, Red China reiterated its intention of taking Formosa—and driving American forces out of the area—by force.

In his October 31, 1959, speech to the Supreme Soviet, Khrushchev said:

We support the [Red] Chinese policy on Formosa.

Khrushchev's two statements appear contradictory. How could he support Peking's intention to take Formosa by force, after proclaiming that it was the "sacred duty" of Communists to end the cold war and guarantee peace on earth?

But the two statements are not contradictory—if you know how to interpret the trick language of Communists, in which words have meanings entirely different from those they have when used by non-Communists.

Communist Aesopian Language

In the preface to the Russian edition of his work "Imperialism," Lenin said that this pamphlet had been written "with an eye to the tsarist censorship" and that, for this reason, he was forced to make his observations on political matters "with extreme caution, by hints, in that Aesopian language—in that cursed Aesopian language—to which tsarism compelled all revolutionaries to have recourse, whenever they took up their pens to write a 'legal' work." Later in the preface, Lenin wrote that "the careful reader will easily substitute" the correct words for the cover words or Aesopian language he had used in the pamphlet to conceal his real meaning from the tsarist censors.³

What is Aesopian language? It is a code by which Communists convey to one another, in words that sound innocent to non-Communists, revolutionary or illegal doctrines, messages, and exhortations. Lenin used it to trick the tsarist censors. Communists use it today to trick the non-Communist world at large. The name of this code is taken from that of Aesop, the ancient Greek writer of fables. The meaning given words in this code is based largely on Marxist-Leninist doctrine.

In the Smith Act trials of the first- and second-string Communist Party leaders, Louis Budenz, former managing editor of the *Daily Worker* and former member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, testified extensively on Communist use of Aesopian language. He said that the Communists had devised this as a means of cloaking their true intentions while conveying revolutionary meanings to initiated party members. He testified, for example, that the term "Marxism-Leninism," which occurs so frequently in Communist statements even today, is a code expression for unlawful activity. He also admitted that he himself had used Aesopian language in a public statement issued at the time he joined the Communist Party in 1935. This statement read in part as follows:

For him who proposes to advance the workers' revolution, there is but one road to follow: the path of the Comintern.

In Communist Aesopian language, Budenz explained, the words "workers' revolution" and "Comintern" were actually a call for the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence. He also testified that the Communists used this Aesopian language in official documents which are designed for public (non-Communist) consumption.

Early in 1959, the committee held a consultation with Dr. Stefan T. Possony, one of the country's leading authorities on the Communist use of Aesopian or code language.⁴ In addition to giving an account of the manner in which Communists manipulate language so that words have a special meaning for them, based on their ideology, Dr. Possony outlined the six fundamentals in Communist use of semantics.

³ "Selected Works," vol. V, pp. 5 and 6, International Publishers, New York, 1943.

⁴ "Language as a Communist Weapon," Consultation with Dr. Stefan T. Possony, Committee on Un-American Activities, Mar. 2, 1959.

Two of these fundamentals have special reference to Aesopian language:

Every Communist communication must convey an orthodox, that is, revolutionarily activating message to the party and its followers.

This same communication must convey a different, i.e., soothing, pacifying, and paralyzing message to the opponent of communism.

These two principles, combined with Lenin's and Budenz' description of Aesopian language, are the key to understanding Khrushchev's statement about it being the sacred duty of Communists to insure peace and his statement supporting Red China's policy of force against Formosa.

Did Khrushchev use Aesopian or code language in either or both of these statements? The answer is that he did in one of them—the one concerning the sacred duty of Communists to insure “the triumph of the cause of peace on earth.” In the other, he merely made a blunt statement about Soviet-Communist policy.

Communist “Peace”⁵

To the mind of the free peoples of the world, the term “peace” means the absence of conflict. In Communist jargon, however, it is basic that there is an inevitable conflict in being at all times between Communist societies and non-Communist societies, and that “peace” can be attained only by the complete subjugation of the world by communism. When the Communists speak of their dedication to the cause of peace, they refer not to the elimination of conflict with non-Communist societies, but to the attainment of the ultimate domination of the world by communism.

Therefore, in Communist thinking, when the Russian tanks were slaughtering the freedom fighters in Hungary and when the North Korean Communist hordes attacked the South Koreans, the “cause of peace” was truly being promoted because it was all in furtherance of the designs of international communism for world domination.

Khrushchev, in emphasizing the “sacred duty of Communists” to “guarantee the triumph of the cause of peace on earth,” was, in Aesopian language, issuing a call to initiated Communists in all parts of the world to step up their subversion of all non-Communist societies by all means possible, including the use of force and violence.

Read in this light, there is no contradiction between the words Khrushchev uttered in Peking and in his address to the Supreme Soviet in Moscow. In the Communist view, the ousting of the Chinese Nationalists and the United States from Formosa is a step toward peace (Communist domination of the world).

What is the “Cold War”?

But, one may ask, why did Khrushchev call on the Communists to end the cold war if he was really urging them, in Communist Aesopian language, to step up their efforts to undermine and destroy the remaining free nations? Wasn't this contradictory? Shouldn't he

⁵ For detailed treatment of this subject matter, the reader is referred to “Facts on Communism, Vol. I, The Communist Ideology,” Committee on Un-American Activities, 86th Congress, 1st Session, December, 1959.

have called on them to step up the cold war, instead of "liquidating" it?

Again, the answer is found in Communist Aesopian language. To the average non-Communist, the cold war is the nonmilitary or non-violent aspects of the struggle which has been going on between the Communist and the free nations since the end of World War II, when the Soviet Union made clear its intention of subjugating free nations by any and all means and they, in turn, determined to resist this Communist design. It involves all steps, outside the military sphere, taken *by either side* in this struggle.

But this is not the way Communists define the cold war. The January 1956 issue of the U.S. Communist Party theoretical organ, Political Affairs, published an article by Max Weiss, a party functionary. Entitled "Geneva and '56," it was based on a report made to the December 1955 National Conference of the U.S. Communist Party. In this article, Weiss defined what U.S. Communists mean by the cold war (*italics added*):

What is the cold war? Is it just a synonym for the social, economic and political struggle of the capitalist world against the Socialist world? No, that struggle began in November 1917 and will continue until capitalism disappears from the face of the earth. If the cold war were merely a synonym for this struggle there could be no prospect for ending the cold war until the world victory of Socialism.

When we talk of the cold war we refer to the form of the struggle by the capitalist world against the Socialist world * * *.

The cold war is a form of this struggle which is neither a shooting war nor a peaceful relationship. To be more precise, the cold war is a special form of this struggle which has been developed in the period since World War II. Its main features are: Massive armaments including A- and H-bomb stockpiles, threat of atomic war, A- and H-bomb diplomacy, regional anti-Soviet military alliances, foreign military bases, military intervention against national liberation movements, trade embargo, prohibition of normal cultural and scientific interchange.

It can be seen from this that, to the U.S. Communists, *the cold war does not include anything done by Moscow to undermine or destroy the United States or any other government. It is strictly limited to those actions taken by the United States to protect itself and others from Communist aggression.*

Moscow sees eye to eye with the U.S. Communist Party on this subject, as can be readily determined from the following definition of "cold war" found in a volume of the Large Soviet Encyclopedia published since Khrushchev's ascendancy to the Number One position in the Soviet Union and the world Communist movement:

"Cold war".—An aggressive political policy, adopted after the end of World War II *towards the USSR and the people's democracies by the reactionary circles of the imperialistic powers* headed by the United States and Great Britain.

* * * The "cold war" is directed towards preventing the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems,

increasing tensions in international relations, and preparing the conditions for unleashing a new world war. (*Italics added.*)⁶

Thus, when Khrushchev said in his speech that it was the "sacred duty" of Communists "to liquidate the cold war," he did not mean that the Communists or the Soviet Union had any intention of ceasing their efforts to undermine and destroy free nations. What he was saying was that it was the sacred duty of Communists to *put an end to all policies and practices of the United States and its allies designed to protect this and other countries from Communist enslavement.* They were to induce or force the United States to disarm, to surrender its A- and H-bomb stockpiles, to break up NATO, SEATO, and other defense alliances, to give up its defense bases abroad and pull its troops out of all foreign countries, to forego intervention on the side of freedom in any nation where the Communists are taking over through civil war, to end its ban on the shipment of strategic goods to the Communist bloc, to recognize Red China—in short, *to give up all resistance to communism!*

Khrushchev's Peking speech was front-paged in newspapers all over the United States and in practically every nation of the world. Millions of Americans read it and were encouraged to think—just as the people of other free nations were—that it meant that chances for ending the cold war and bringing peace to the world were greatly improved by what Khrushchev had said.

But millions of Communists all over the world also read his words—and *knew* that it was *not* a call for real peace or for ending the cold war, but merely a Communist semantic trick to lull the West into a false sense of security and, at the same time, convey to Communist conspirators everywhere an Aesopian order for a continuing, intensified struggle to destroy free governments.

Khrushchev's statement fulfilled two of the basic principles of Aesopian language as described by Dr. Possony. To the initiated Communists who understand this language, his words were an exhortation for them to continue their subversion of the United States and all non-Communist nations. At the same time, through use of the word "peace" and the phrase "liquidate the cold war," Khrushchev was conveying a different, a "soothing, pacifying, and paralyzing message to the opponent of communism."

The U.S. Communist Party believes it can grow and recover in the 60's its membership losses of the 50's because it believes that the majority of Americans and other free-world peoples and their leaders do not know how to interpret the Communist Party's and Khrushchev's statements; and it is convinced that it, echoing Khrushchev, can now hoodwink substantial portions of the U.S. population with pious-sounding phrases.

It is for this reason that the meaning of a now frequently used, deceptive Communist slogan will be discussed briefly here.

⁶ Bol'shaia sovetskaiia entsiklopediia (Large Soviet Encyclopedia), 2d ed., vol. 46 (1957), p. 297.

What is "Peaceful Coexistence"?

A major theme of U.S. Communist Party propaganda today is an echo of the "peaceful coexistence" line of Moscow. Communist Party publications make repeated references to it. The party's leaders talk of it constantly. The draft political resolution for the recent Communist Party convention stated that Premier Khrushchev's visit to the United States and President Eisenhower's scheduled return visit to the U.S.S.R. constituted "a truly momentous advance in the fight for peaceful coexistence."

What do the U.S. Communists—and other Communists—mean when they talk of peaceful coexistence? Do they really believe that the United States and the Soviet Union can coexist permanently in a peaceful, nonwar relationship—as they would have us believe?

The concept of peaceful coexistence is old in Communist ranks. Lenin enunciated it. Stalin and his lieutenants pushed it—as did Malenkov. Today Khrushchev is stressing it more than any of his predecessors ever did. Communist leaders have always referred to it as a "Leninist" concept, but neither they nor Lenin have ever spoken of anything like *permanent* peaceful coexistence. The most they have ever said was that "prolonged" peaceful coexistence was possible.

In Lenin's view, peaceful coexistence during the period of "capitalist encirclement" was no more than a breathing spell for Communists, providing them with an opportunity to catch their breath after a conquest. As he used it originally, it was the breathing spell which followed the conquest of Russia by the Communists in the Bolshevik Revolution. But even while he propounded this idea, Lenin stated (1920):

* * * as soon as we are strong enough to defeat capitalism as a whole, we shall immediately take it by the scruff of the neck.

Since Lenin's time, the Communists have used the peaceful coexistence theme to provide a breathing spell following their conquests of Eastern Europe, Mainland China, and other areas.

The concept of peaceful coexistence means no more than that Communists are realists. They face the fact today, as they have in the past, that a complete, immediate world Communist revolution is not possible because of the power of the non-Communist bloc. The fulfillment of the revolution must, therefore, be postponed for a time. The Communists, at times, must become partners in a strategic truce with capitalist powers which will pave the way for future advances for them once they have accumulated greater strength. Meanwhile, the time of the completion of the revolution will be continually advanced by internal subversion and all other means short of general war.

Stalin repeatedly pointed out that the idea of peaceful coexistence was based on the relative power of the two opposing camps. In a May 9, 1925, speech, he said it was based on the fact that "a certain temporary equilibrium" had been reached between the capitalist and Communist forces, with capitalism having a slight advantage.⁷ Somewhat later, on December 2, 1927, he said that peaceful relations with foreign countries were "an obligatory task for us" because, as Lenin had pointed out, the success of communism depended on delaying the

⁷ Soviet Documents on Foreign Policy, 1925-32, Oxford University Press, London, 1952, edited by Jane Degras, vol. II, p. 26.

inevitable war with the capitalist nations until conditions were more favorable for the Communists.⁸

Khrushchev is sometimes completely honest when he speaks of "peaceful coexistence." At the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February 1956, for example, he spoke very carefully on the subject of peaceful coexistence in an obvious attempt to inform all Communists just what was meant by it:

The Leninist principle of peaceful co-existence of states or differing social systems was, and remains, the general line of our country's foreign policy.

It is important to note that in this statement he said nothing about *permanent* peaceful coexistence and was careful to point out that peaceful coexistence was no more than the "general line" of Soviet foreign policy. This is a clear indication that he was not repudiating the classic Communist doctrines of permanent class conflict, of constant clashes between the capitalist and Communist powers, and of a final showdown between the two.

More important, Khrushchev took note in his speech of the fact that his incessant harping on "peaceful coexistence" had evidently affected—in the wrong way—some Communists and was endangering the purity of their ideology. He warned them against misinterpreting the phrase and told them specifically how it was *not* to be interpreted:

* * * concerning the possibility of peaceful co-existence of states with differing social-political systems, some party workers are trying to transfer this thesis into the ideological sphere. This is a dangerous fallacy.

These words were a clear warning to all Communists that the idea of peaceful coexistence as a fundamental or lasting Communist doctrine or as an ideological belief was wrong and evil, "a dangerous fallacy."

In a speech delivered in Leningrad on July 6, 1957, Khrushchev was explicit in spelling out the reason why the Soviet Union is now pushing the peaceful coexistence line. He described peaceful coexistence as "a policy directed to the *strengthening* of our mighty Socialist camp." (*Italics added.*)

He also revealed the purpose behind this policy in his address to the Twenty-first Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in January 1959, when he said while discussing the "principal tasks" of the Communists in the years ahead in the field of foreign policy:

The fundamental problem of the coming seven years is to *make the most of the time factor* in socialism's peaceful economic competition with capitalism (*italics added*).

This is a clear statement on Khrushchev's part that he does not expect peaceful coexistence to last too long, that he considers it no more than a policy line he is using temporarily because he believes it is to the advantage of the Communists to do so.

Allen Dulles, director of the Central Intelligence Agency, pointed out a fact which clarifies what the Communists mean by peaceful coexistence, in an address on December 15, 1959. In discussing the tac-

⁸ Stalin's Collected Works, vol. X, pp. 288-289.

tics the Kremlin had been using in the recent past and will probably continue to use in the years immediately ahead, he said that it had placed special emphasis on the idea of "coexistence" in the messages it sent to the West. He then added:

* * * However to avoid any confusion among the Communist Party "faithful" the latter have recently received clarifying directives which point out that: "In the ideological field there never was peaceful coexistence between Socialism and Capitalism and there never can be."

As Dr. Possony said in his consultation with the committee:

Coexistence is a temporary situation, and it is a description of fact. It also is a slogan to lull non-Communists to sleep and to induce economic and political support for the Soviet Union.

It specifically does *not* mean that any Communists ought to be prepared to coexist with the capitalist system till the end of the world. Essentially, the term is a deception to convey the impression that the world revolution has been called off.

The Conspiracy in the Days Ahead

The proceedings of the Seventeenth Communist Party Convention held in December 1959 indicate that, for the most part, the party will follow the same basic strategy and tactics it has been pursuing for the last few years. "Peace" will be the central theme of the Communist Party propaganda and agitation. The party has found that this word serves well to mislead many non-Communists about the Communists' true aims. This theme, however, will not be used only in a general way. Party leader Gus Hall told the delegates at the convention that they must tie the peace theme to specific secondary ideas to give it greater effectiveness.

The party can be expected to make a stronger pitch to big business representatives. This decision is apparently based, to a great extent, on the fact that appearances before business organizations served as a valuable sounding board for Khrushchev during his visit to the United States and also on the activities in recent years of prominent business men, such as Cyrus Eaton, who have done so much to promote the Communist propaganda line.

Hall urged the delegates at the Communist Party convention to show industrialists how "peace" could increase their profits. As far as the people at large were concerned, they were to be told how peace and total disarmament (another major propaganda line) will bring great benefits to them—that it will make possible the spending of billions of dollars for schools, roads, hospitals, parks, and housing instead of for defense.

Because the party's concentrated efforts over a period of many years have failed to convert a significant number of Negro followers to its cause, it made a complete break at the convention with what has been the major doctrine of the party on the Negro question since its earliest days in this country. It formally rejected the idea of a separate "black belt" nation for Negroes within the present borders of the United

States. This, the party hopes, will lessen Negro resistance to its propaganda and teachings.

As far as the theme of "peace" is concerned, Negroes will be told that they will have much better opportunity to break down discrimination of all kinds in a peace-time, rather than a war-time, economy.

On selling disarmament to the American people, Hall again stressed the fact that the approaches must vary. One group should be appealed to on the ground of the alleged benefits they will receive from trade with the Soviet bloc. In convincing others of the desirability for total disarmament, the party should play on the fear of nuclear fall-out.

United-Front Strategy

The committee has previously pointed out that the Communist Party tactics in recent years have called for infiltration of mass non-Communist organizations by individual party members who conceal their affiliation with the conspiracy and pose as "liberals" to promote the party line. Witnesses who have served as undercover agents for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and have appeared before the committee in the last year have confirmed this statement. There is every indication that the Communist Party will continue to use this device in the immediate future. The draft political resolution for the 1959 convention stated that—

the Party's influence, mass contacts and relationships are increasing in a number of areas and fields of work.

Hall, in his keynote address at the convention, stated:

In a nation like ours, where almost everyone belongs to one or more mass organizations, this is a firm and certainly a broad base. Here is where we should be working to help build and elevate the peace movement.

The National Executive Committee letter of November 1, 1959, bringing to the attention of party members the "significant developments" that had taken place since the draft political resolution was written, gloatingly told the conspiracy's members:

* * * we already witness significant new signs of breaking our isolation and becoming involved as a significant factor in the mass movements. And the present objective conditions offer real possibilities for expanding this trend.

One of the fall issues of the Soviet magazine *Partiynaya Zhizn* (Party Life) featured an article in celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the U.S. Communist Party. It was written by Herbert Aptheker, who was elected a member of the U.S. party's National Committee at the recent convention. Describing what had taken place after the February 1957 Sixteenth Communist Party Convention, Aptheker wrote:

Organizational activities revived, the loss in the number of the party members was made up, and a certain number of new members, particularly among youth, were acquired. The party tackled educational work and the dissemination of Marxist literature. The most important thing was that the party resumed participation in work with the masses. This refers to the intratrade-union struggle, to demonstrations of

the unemployed held recently, and to certain aspects of the struggle of the Negroes, particularly to the movement for integrated classes in schools.

The party plays an important role in the struggle against preparations for war and the foreign policy of the "cold war." It extends assistance to various mass antiwar organizations and has begun developing a struggle for peace directly among the masses. Recently, it has organized street meetings and demonstrations in some of the largest cities.

Along with the tactics of infiltrating mass non-Communist organizations, the party can be expected to step up its united-front strategy by attempting to win the open cooperation of non-Communist organizations in various campaigns and in agitational activity.

After urging party members to work in mass organizations, Gus Hall, in his convention speech, said:

While doing so, we should also have our sights on more concerted and united movements, conferences and actions of various kinds on local, state and national levels. If the central issue of peace is to give rise to the greatest, most persistent crusade of our times, what is needed is not one but a number of national centers to guide, prod and organize it. Not only is this necessary with respect to specific issues but in addition, it seems to me, the youth, women, farmers, veterans and other groups need such special centers of direction.

At a later point in his speech, he summarized the objectives of the united-front strategy as follows:

We want to participate in, organize and lead the broadest of united front movements—on every level—in a thousand ways, in 10,000 places, on 100,000 issues—if possible, with 180,000,000 people. Obviously, we cannot make an understanding of the anti-monopoly character of these struggles on the part of others a condition for a united front. But we ourselves must at all times understand that this is their basic nature.

This statement highlights another key aspect of Communist Party propaganda and agitation in the months ahead. While the party will center its work on the themes of peace and disarmament in the field of international affairs, it will, on the home front, center its work around a drive against the big business "monopolies."

Communist documents and convention proceedings indicate that while the Communist Party is pleased in general with the attitude of big business on foreign policy matters (and Khrushchev), it is not happy with its internal policies.

Gus Hall charged in his convention speech that big business is "developing a most far-reaching, concentrated drive against labor, whose aim is to deprive the unions of all economic and political power, and to place them under complete government domination and control."

The Communists will use this line in a renewed effort to ingratiate themselves with the working man and regain the influence they once wielded in the U.S. trade union movement.

In this chapter the committee has been able to touch only briefly on a few aspects of Communist activity and propaganda. It would again emphasize the fact that the total threat of communism to this country

is not limited to the activities of the entity known formally as the Communist Party. Communist diplomatic establishments, the Kremlin's espionage apparatus, and the many thousands of Communists who are not formally enrolled in the party are some of the other elements in the total Communist operation which are playing important roles in the international conspiracy's plan for subverting our freedom. The continuing activity of these groups, coupled with the renewed vitality and activity manifested by the party itself since the recent visit of Premier Khrushchev, are grounds for sober concern and increased watchfulness on the part of all Americans.

CHAPTER II

HEARINGS

THE KREMLIN'S ESPIONAGE AND TERROR ORGANIZATIONS

TESTIMONY OF PETR S. DERIABIN

The operations of the Soviet secret police were portrayed by Petr S. Deriabin in testimony released by the committee on March 17, 1959.¹ Until his defection to the West in 1954, Mr. Deriabin was an officer in various Soviet secret police organizations which, in addition to being responsible for protecting the U.S.S.R.'s internal security, were also charged with carrying out foreign espionage for the Soviet Union.

The fact that Deriabin had broken from the dreaded Soviet intelligence apparatus on February 15, 1954, was kept a secret for 5 years because of the extremely sensitive nature of the information he possessed and to protect him from possible reprisal.

Mr. Deriabin, now only 38 years of age, spent nearly 10 years as an officer in Soviet state security work. At the time of his break he was stationed at the Soviet Embassy in Vienna as an intelligence officer in the foreign espionage branch of the MGB. The MGB, then a section of the MVD (Ministry of Internal Affairs), has since become a powerful separate organization engaging in intelligence, espionage, and internal security work under the name KGB (Committee of State Security).

After serving 5 years in the Soviet Army, Deriabin in 1944 had entered the Counter-Intelligence School in Moscow. His first assignment after spending a year in training was as an officer in the headquarters of the counter-intelligence in Moscow.

SOVIET INTERNAL SECURITY

From March 1947 until April 1952, Deriabin was an officer of the Guard Directorate (also known as the Okhrana), a branch of the MVD responsible for guarding Soviet leaders. Deriabin's particular task was to check the officers and people who worked in the Guard Directorate. He estimated that 16,000 officers were assigned to the Guard.

The Okhrana, Mr. Deriabin said, kept a round-the-clock guard on the Communist hierarchy, guarding them in their homes, in their offices, on their travels, and during their public appearances. A security check was also made of all individuals who came in contact with the Communist leaders.

¹ See "The Kremlin's Espionage and Terror Organizations—Testimony of Petr S. Deriabin," Mar. 17, 1959, Hearing before Committee on Un-American Activities.

In contrast to the average Russian, who is barely able to meet his day-to-day needs, top Communist leaders live in absolute luxury, Deriabin stated. They have large homes owned by the government and their own collective farms, which provide them with fruits, vegetables, dairy products, and meats. They also have cars, chauffeurs, and even their own barbers, and have access to rest homes and private hospitals.

Because Communist leaders distrust each other, there is a constant surveillance of their activities and private lives, Mr. Deriabin testified. He explained that the Guard Directorate reported directly to the boss of the Kremlin, who today is Khrushchev.

Citizens in all walks of life are subjected to secret police supervision, Deriabin stated. The main headquarters of the secret police is in Moscow, but each Soviet Republic has its own secret police headquarters. In fact, he said, there are directorates of the Soviet secret police to watch over economic, cultural, and political life inside the Soviet Union.

He identified as two important branches under the secret police, the political directorate, which covers the cultural life of Russia and government employees, and the economical directorate, which watches over Soviet industry, machinery, and agriculture. Mr. Deriabin added that there also exists a directorate over the military. The secret police cover every phase of Soviet life, and its representatives are found everywhere—in every factory, every collective farm, every office, every apartment building.

ESPIONAGE ABROAD

From April 1952 until he defected in 1954, Mr. Deriabin was an officer in the Austrian-German section of MGB [now KGB and referred to as such hereafter]. He served for a period of time in Moscow, but was later transferred to Vienna where he worked until he sought asylum in the United States. The espionage apparatus, Mr. Deriabin stated, had 3,000 officers at its Moscow headquarters and some 15,000 agents operating around the world. These operatives conducted espionage and counterespionage abroad, carried on surveillance of Soviet and satellite citizens traveling abroad, and even resorted to assassination, kidnapping, and blackmail.

The United States is considered by the Kremlin to be the major enemy of the Soviet Union and is one of the main targets of its intelligence operation in the West, Deriabin stated. Other important targets are the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, he said.

Mr. Deriabin explained the methods by which agents gain access to countries in order to obtain economic, political, and military information. Soviet and satellite embassies and consulates have on their staffs one or more KGB officers who carry on espionage for the Kremlin. Agents also work through Amtorg (Soviet trade organization), Intourist, and the Tass News Agency, 60 to 70% of whose representatives are KGB members. Soviet and Iron Curtain agents are in other foreign missions, as well as in professional delegations and in cultural and other exchange groups, he stated.

When a religious group from the Soviet Union visited the United States in 1956, it was headed by Archbishop Nikolai, who, though not an actual member of the KGB, has nevertheless served as its agent

since World War II by passing on information to the apparatus, Mr. Deriabin testified. When the Moiseyev dancers toured this country, Lieutenant Colonel Kudriavtsev, a member of the troupe, also worked for the Soviet intelligence.

Recruiting individuals for espionage work in free nations, Mr. Deriabin stated, is accomplished through blackmail and bribery of residents of the free nations and sometimes through brainwashing prisoners of war before their return to free countries. The Soviet espionage apparatus sends agents to other countries as immigrants, for the purpose of setting up espionage networks. Others are ordered to go to the West, ostensibly to seek political asylum, but actually to become agents.

The KGB is only one of the Soviet intelligence organizations engaged in espionage, Mr. Deriabin said. Another major apparatus is called the GRU, under the General Staff of the Soviet Army, which carries on espionage through the Soviet military apparatus.

CALIFORNIA

A reorganized and reinvigorated Communist operation in southern California was searchingly scrutinized by the committee in a series of hearings in that State during 1959.

SPRING 1959

The committee received testimony from 20 witnesses in executive session in Los Angeles on February 24 and 25, 1959. This was a continuation of executive hearings which were initiated in Los Angeles in September 1958 and in the course of which 44 witnesses had been heard.

The testimony of these 64 witnesses was made public and printed by the committee in April 1959.² It was accompanied by a special "Report on the Southern California District of the Communist Party," in which the committee analyzed the results of the two hearings and its independent staff investigations.

Far-reaching reorganizational measures aimed at increasing the effectiveness of Communist activities in the California community were revealed in these hearings, which also spotlighted many of the current leaders of the Communist operation in the State.³

AUTUMN 1959

The committee held a second series of public hearings in Los Angeles, California, on October 20, 21, and 22, 1959,⁴ at which time 27 witnesses were heard.

In its previous inquiry into the "rejuvenated" Communist movement in California, the committee had stripped the cloak of secrecy from party operational procedures and leadership in the party's top echelons in southern California—the so-called "district" level. The Southern California District of the Communist Party, however, is

² See "The Southern California District of the Communist Party," Parts 1-3. Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities, Sept. 2-5, 1958, and Feb. 24 and 25, 1959.

³ For more complete details of this operation see pp. 76-79 in which the committee summarizes the special report issued as a result of the hearings.

⁴ See "Western Section of the Southern California District of the Communist Party," Parts 1-3. Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities, Oct. 20-22, 1959, which will be printed during 1960.

actually subdivided into 28 party "sections" which are further subdivided into local party "clubs." It is principally on these lower party levels, encompassing the bulk of the party's membership, that party policies, channeled down from national headquarters through district leaders, are given practical effect.

The October hearings of the committee, therefore, sought to ascertain the concrete, day-to-day efforts of rank-and-file Communists to carry out specific strategies aimed at expanding Communist power and influence in southern California. The committee had information that all of the 27 witnesses whom it subpoenaed for the hearings were currently or recently engaged in Communist activities in what is now the Western Section of the Southern California District of the Communist Party. The Western Section roughly covers the western portion of Los Angeles County—a large geographical area which extends as far south as Redondo Beach, as far north as Malibu Beach, and includes the area known as West Los Angeles, as well as part of Beverly Hills.

As a result of the October hearings, the committee obtained a wealth of information on contemporary Communist tactics. Particularly valuable testimony was presented by Mrs. Moïselle J. Clinger, Mrs. Marion Miller, and Mrs. Adele Kronick Silva, all of whom had served as undercover operatives for the Federal Bureau of Investigation within Communist Party units in western Los Angeles County. Mrs. Clinger, of Santa Monica, had served in the Communist Party from 1942 until 1956; Mrs. Miller, of West Los Angeles, was in party activities from 1952 until late 1955, while Mrs. Silva, now living in Oakland, had worked with Communists in West Los Angeles in 1950. The committee also heard testimony on recent internal problems of the Communist Party from Harper Poulson, of Los Angeles, who left the party in January 1957 in disagreement with certain of its policies. Mr. Poulson invoked the privilege of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination, however, when questioned regarding other individuals active in the Communist conspiracy.

Startling illustrations of Communist efforts to enter and influence non-Communist organizations and institutions were presented in the course of the hearings, which also included testimony on the mechanics by which Communists have set up their own "front" organizations to lure support from non-Communist Californians. The testimony furthermore revealed various tactics by which the party protected its conspirators from possible legal consequences of membership. A multitude of Communist techniques for raising funds for the party's work were also described in striking detail.

The committee obtained such important and extensive evidence on Communist conspiratorial techniques as a result of these hearings that it is preparing a separate report on the subject. The report will be published in 1960.

Evasion of Communist-Control Laws

Committee investigations in the Los Angeles area, as well as in other areas of the Nation, have shown that in order to avoid detection of its members, the Communist Party membership lists, Communist Party cards, and other indicia of membership have been abandoned.

Witnesses who appeared before the committee in Los Angeles in October 1959 offered significant additional information on the strategy of the Communist Party regarding "membership." Mrs. Moisselle Clinger, a former FBI undercover agent who testified on October 20, stated that the party wanted her to continue her activities in its behalf and support it financially even after she had withdrawn from the organization in 1956:

Mr. TAVENNER. Well, it appears then that although you were severing your connection as a member of the Communist Party, they were asking you to continue in your activity in the Communist Party?

Mrs. CLINGER. That is correct. I mean, that I would at least support them financially and, possibly later when I felt better, to do other things.

Mr. TAVENNER. You were expected to be affiliated with the Communist Party although not actually a member in the legal sense?

Mrs. CLINGER. That is correct.

Mr. TAVENNER. Now, that is one problem this committee is studying. Section 5 of the Communist Control Act of 1954 enumerates about fourteen different matters which the courts and juries should take into consideration in determining whether or not a person is a member of the Communist Party. It seems now that because of the device which has been used in your case to attempt to get you to remain affiliated, although actually not a member, this has to be dealt with in some manner by Congress.

Mrs. Marion Miller testified on the subject of Communists within and out of the party:

Mrs. MILLER. * * * Many people are Communists who actually are not members of the party. We should differentiate, because I know that within the last forty years we have had a half million people that have been brought to our attention by statistics who have joined the Communist Party and dropped out, while there has been relatively a smaller number who have been willing to testify in behalf of their Government, and who really have had a change of heart and have become good loyal dedicated American citizens for the most part.

I have found from my experience that at least, and this is a conservative number, at least fifty percent, fifty percent of this half a million people—did I say a quarter of a million before, or half a million? Half a million is correct, fifty percent of this half a million people, if it came to a showdown whether their loyalties lie with the Soviet Union or with the United States in case of emergency, still are sympathetic with what they call the "Father of Scientific Socialism," that is Russia, they are still sympathetic because they feel that this is a country that will lead the way, and will show them the proper way. So there we have to reckon with, you see, a quarter of a million former Communists who are not actually party members, that is, they do not pay dues.

I would like to explain, it is not easy to stay in the Communist Party, because to be a good loyal dedicated Communist, it takes all of your time, your money, and energy, and Communists can be selfish, too many of them say, I can be a good Communist and not go to meetings, just like a good lot of people can say I can be a good Christian and not go to church on Sunday. They follow out the party line. They subscribe to the Communist publications. They give their donations. They attend these front organizations, and these other groups, and when they are within their own legitimate organizations they are promoting communism.

This is the point. You see, so that is what many people who dropped out are still promoting communism, certainly they haven't become Communists per se.

Mr. JACKSON. You say all Communists are not in the Communist Party?

Mrs. MILLER. Right.

As a former official in one of the party's most ambitious "front" organizations in the area, the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, Mrs. Miller also testified on how front organizations have sought to evade provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act:

Mr. TAVENNER. Earlier in your testimony you mentioned the fact that the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born had no membership as such; what did you mean by that?

Mrs. MILLER. Well, I meant that the people who attended all the affairs, who came to the conferences and the testimonial dinners were not members per se, because under the Internal Security Act of 1950, the members of Communist-front organizations, if they were discovered or proven to be Communist-front organizations would have to register. So these front organizations were extremely cautious in calling themselves membership organizations. They resisted the idea that it was a membership organization.

Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, that is a device to get around the provisions of the present act?

Mrs. MILLER. That is correct, but we have to certainly consider these people who spend their time, or much of their, let's say, free time, when they are not actually working for a living, with this Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, certainly as participants, or if you want to call them affiliates, if you don't want to call them members; perhaps this is one way you might get around it. The people who are chairmen of trade-union committees, or nationality or deportee committees, or area defense committees, and the components, the members of these individual committees, who compose not only the executive board, but come to these quarterly meetings that were held four times a year, the Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, to my way of thinking, ought certainly to be held responsible for their actions. If this is considered subversive, as it has been designated by the Sub-

versive Activities Control Board, these are the people who should be held accountable because they know what they are doing, and they are giving their time freely, and their money, too.

Mr. TAVENNER. And actually if you lay all fine points aside, there is actually no difference between being affiliated with that organization and being a member other than the name "member," isn't that right?

Mrs. MILLER. Not to an intelligent person, I don't see how there could be a difference at all.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

On March 10, 11, and 12, 1959, the committee held a series of hearings in Pittsburgh, Pa., encompassing three phases of Communist activity in the Greater Pittsburgh area: the current strategy and tactics of the Communist Party; problems of security in industrial establishments holding defense contracts; and problems arising in cases of denaturalization and deportation of Communists, of which cases a substantial number have occurred in the Pittsburgh district.

CURRENT STRATEGY AND TACTICS

Mary and Hamp Golden, who, through great personal sacrifice, were members of the Communist Party for more than a decade at the request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, were the first of 12 witnesses heard on March 10.⁵ The Goldenes were members of the Communist Party from 1946 until they appeared before the committee and revealed for the first time that they were undercover agents for the Government.

Mr. Golden related that a Communist Party member is taught the principles of Marxism as it pertains to both economic and political situations, how to meet and work in political groups, and how to control and lead front organizations along the party line. He testified that the Communist operation is currently more dangerous than in the past, even though the visible members of the Communist Party are fewer. Characterizing the Communist Party as a revolutionary group, Mr. and Mrs. Golden described the arduous discipline of the Communist Party over the comrades. In portraying the dedication and zeal of Communists, Mr. Golden stated:

They never sleep. You work 24 hours a day. You attend maybe two meetings in an evening and at midnight or early in the morning you pass out leaflets and literature at plant gates. You never have a minute of your own, no social life whatsoever of your own.

During his 12-year tenure in the party, Mr. Golden held a number of responsible positions within the Communist operation, including membership on the executive board of the North Side Club of the Communist Party in Pittsburgh. He was made chairman of a cell when, for "security reasons," the party instituted its "cutout system," whereby the large groups were broken down into cells of five members.

⁵ See "Current Strategy and Tactics of Communists in the United States (Greater Pittsburgh Area,—Pt. 1)," Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities, March 10, 1959.

The witness recalled that after Matthew Cvetic testified before this committee in 1950 regarding the Communist operations in the area, many individual Communists were frightened and shortly thereafter discontinued formal membership in the party. Nevertheless, he declared, they were still Communists and could be counted on to donate money and distribute leaflets in organizations to which they belonged.

Presently the party's routine activities are almost completely underground, with the open activity effected through the party's creation and control of front organizations. Mr. Golden explained that the party's principal target is the labor organizations; that although the comrades are taught to infiltrate all unions, the particular emphasis is in the steel, electrical, and food industries holding Government contracts. This, Mr. Golden asserted, was to place the Communists where they would be in a position to help create chaos in the event it was necessary.

The Communist Party instructs each member to work hard in his individual union to align himself with the union leadership, carry out union assignments, and become known as a "good, loyal union man," Mr. Golden stated. In this way the Communists would be in a position to obtain leadership positions where they could control union policies. Mr. Golden also testified that despite the fact that under the Taft-Hartley Act, union officers have been required to file non-Communist affidavits, the Communist Party encourages its members to run for union office. In the event they are elected, they are instructed by the party to sign the non-Communist affidavit and put "the burden of proof on the Government" to prove they were party members.

One of the highlights of the Goldens' testimony was their revelation of the concentrated efforts on the part of the Communist Party to exert influence on Members of Congress and other Government officials. In addition to calling on their local Congressmen, the party attempted to pressure the Congress by having its members deluge Government officials with letters and telegrams urging them to support or oppose particular legislation of concern to the party. The Members of Congress would have no way of knowing that the senders were acting under orders of the Communist conspiracy.

Revealing the tactics employed by the Communist Party in regard to a congressional investigation, the Goldens told of a meeting attended by 13 Communist Party members who were scheduled to appear as witnesses before the committee. The meeting convened in the office of Hymen Schlesinger, an attorney whom the Goldens knew to be a Communist and who subsequently served as counsel for most of the witnesses at the committee's hearings. The purpose of the gathering, according to the Goldens, was to discuss how the witnesses should evade answering committee questions and, at the same time, vilify the committee while on the witness stand. Also discussed at the meeting, the witnesses explained, were plans which had been made by the party to arouse the citizenry of Pittsburgh against the committee and its hearings. In this endeavor they were instructed to contact numerous non-Communist groups, political leaders, and newspapers without, of course, disclosing the fact that they were members of the Communist Party. Also present at the attorney's office was Clark Foreman, whom the Goldens said appeared as a representative of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, a cited

Communist-front organization. Mr. Foreman advised those present that the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee was arranging for advertisements in the local press—advertisements designed to provoke sentiment in favor of abolishing the committee.

COMMUNIST FRONTS IN THE PITTSBURGH AREA

The party's organized protest against the hearings was spearheaded by the Independent Voters League, a Communist-controlled organization. The Golden's testified that one of its purposes is to fight any committee or any law that tends to curb the Communist Party in its activities. The League's president and secretary, Joseph Rudiak and Alexander Staber, respectively, were identified as members of the Communist Party by the Golden's. Both men were called as witnesses during the hearings and invoked the fifth-amendment privilege against self-incrimination when asked to confirm or deny the testimony of the Golden's respecting their Communist Party membership and activities. As a result of the evidence presented at the hearings, the committee alerted the citizenry of Pittsburgh to the true nature of the Communist Party's newest front organization in the area.

Another Communist front about which Mrs. Golden testified was the Housewives Protest Committee. This organization, originally known as the Housewives Price Protest Committee, was created and controlled by the Communist Party. Its original purpose was to oppose the lifting of price controls, but it was later used to raise money, distribute petitions, and conduct letterwriting campaigns. Among the Communist Party members Mrs. Golden identified as also having been active in the Housewives Protest Committee were Miriam Schultz and Anna Devunich, both of whom appeared as witnesses during the hearings and invoked the fifth-amendment privilege against self-incrimination in refusing to answer questions relating to their Communist Party membership or activities.

The evidence obtained at the hearings also revealed that the North Side Peace Club is another Communist-front organization operating in the Pittsburgh area. It was created by Communists in response to Communist Party instructions to organize peace clubs in various sections of the city in order to galvanize opposition to universal military training, atom bomb testing, and the Korean War.

Esther Steinberg and Viola Schmidt, identified by Mrs. Golden as members of the Communist Party who were active in the Peace Club, were called as witnesses, but declined to give the committee any information and invoked the fifth-amendment privilege against self-incrimination.

The Nationality Committee of Western Pennsylvania, another local front for the Communist Party, worked concurrently with the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, according to Mrs. Golden. She explained that the party felt that many people who would not work with the ACPFB, since it was cited as subversive,⁶ would work with the Nationality Committee in the fight to repeal the Immigration and Nationality Act. It is clear from the testimony that

⁶ American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born has been cited in numerous reports by HUAC since as early as 1942. The Nationality Committee of Western Pennsylvania was first cited in 1957 in the committee report on Communist Political Subversion.

this Communist front was designed to carry on the work of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

In addition to supplying the committee with much valuable information concerning the operations of the Communist Party in the Pittsburgh area, the Goldens identified over 100 individuals they knew to be members of the Communist Party. They identified Alex Steinberg as one of the leaders of the Communist movement in Pittsburgh, and their information concerning him was corroborated by the testimony of Mr. R. J. Hardin, who also had served as an undercover agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Following the Goldens' testimony, the committee called eight persons who had been identified by the Goldens and confirmed by staff investigation to be current, active leaders of the Communist Party in the Pittsburgh area. They declined to give the committee any information concerning their role in the Communist conspiracy in Pittsburgh, and invoked the fifth-amendment privilege against self-incrimination when asked to confirm or deny the testimony of the Goldens respecting their Communist Party membership and activities.

PROBLEMS OF SECURITY IN DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENTS

The second phase of the hearings was held on March 11.⁷ The committee heard eight witnesses in its effort to determine if additional security legislation is necessary in order to guard strategic defense facilities against acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion.

Previous investigations by the committee disclosed that the Communist movement has consistently sought to penetrate not only defense industries where classified work is being performed, but also basic industries which, while not engaged in classified work, may be in support of industries which manufacture modern weapons.

Representing the Department of Defense, Messrs. A. Tyler Port, Robert Applegate, and Robert T. Andrews testified that under existing law and procedures, the Department of Defense, through its contracts, does not have the authority to preclude employment of Communists in a defense facility if the individual concerned does not have access to classified information.

Additional testimony revealed that the Defense Department does not have the authority to exclude Communists from working in a defense facility even though he may be working on what may become a part of a highly classified piece of material, so long as the particular piece he is working on has not itself been classified.

Mr. Port testified that under existing law and procedures, the Defense Department is not empowered to preclude Communists from facilities which operate in support of defense plants, for example, power plants and communications facilities. The Department, he said, was fully aware that the potential for bringing defense production to a halt by sabotage of power facilities is enormous and that if the defense plants were unable to produce the weapons which are essential to our national defense effort because of a power cut-off, the repercussions would be disastrous.

It was also brought out in testimony that, under the existing law, there is nothing to prohibit the Government from entering into a con-

⁷ See "Problems of Security in Industrial Establishments Holding Defense Contracts (Greater Pittsburgh Area—Part 2)," Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities, March 11, 1959

tract with a facility where the certified bargaining agent has been found to be under Communist domination as, for example, the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America or the American Communications Association.

Mr. Port stated that there are five plants in the Pittsburgh area which have contracts with the Department of Defense and in which the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America has bargaining rights. He asserted that a Communist-dominated labor organization holding bargaining rights for workers within defense facilities could serve the cause of international communism by calling strikes, by collecting dues from members of the union to provide financial help to the Communist operation, and by engaging in propaganda activities.

He further testified that the North Atlantic cable, in addition to tie lines and lease lines of the Pentagon itself, was still being serviced by the American Communications Association and that, through a monitoring system, employees who are members of the American Communications Association servicing the tie lines and lease lines could have access to confidential messages emanating from the Pentagon.

The witnesses declared that, since at least 1952, the Department of Defense has been asking for legislation which would preclude access of Communists to defense facilities, as well as legislation to eliminate the problem of individuals who, there is reason to believe, would engage in sabotage, espionage, or other acts of subversion.

Mr. Port stated that in 1952 Jack Small, then chairman of the Munitions Board, testified before the Congress on the necessity of such legislation. Secretary of the Army Brucker appeared before Congress in 1955 and discussed the same problem. In 1957, Mr. Port and Mr. Applegate testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities concerning the interest of the Department of Defense in legislation which would close the gap between the exclusion of security risks from classified work and their exclusion from defense facilities generally.

On January 29, 1959, Mr. Gordon H. Scherer, of Ohio, a member of this committee, introduced a bill in the House of Representatives which bears the number H.R. 3693. Although the bill has not been referred to this committee for consideration, it was largely prompted by factual material which the Committee on Un-American Activities has developed over the course of many months on the subject of the problems of security in industrial establishments holding defense contracts.

In his testimony on March 11, 1959, Mr. Port indicated that the Scherer bill, which would authorize the Federal Government to take certain measures in order to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of sabotage, espionage, or other subversion, is the same type of legislation which the Department of Defense and the military have been advocating for many years in order to preclude access of Communists to defense plants.

The chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities subsequently introduced H.R. 8121 on July 7, 1959, on the subject of industrial security. The bill was referred to this committee and reported out on September 2, 1959, with the recommendation that

the legislative proposal be enacted into law. For details of this bill, see page 133 of this report dealing with the committee's legislative recommendations.

Following the testimony of the representatives of the Department of Defense, the committee called as witnesses four officials of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union and its general counsel, Frank Donner.

Thomas J. Quinn, UE field organizer, was the first union official to testify. Mr. Quinn had previously been identified as a Communist Party member in the UE by Matthew Cvetic in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1950 and before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in 1953. He was also identified as a member of the Communist Party by Hamp Golden during the instant hearings.

Mr. Quinn has been a member of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union since 1940. In an official capacity he has served in the union as a shop steward; legislative chairman of a local; UE representative of District 6, covering western Pennsylvania; and field organizer for the international. In 1953 Mr. Quinn was elected president of Local 601 in Pittsburgh but, following his appearance as a witness before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, when he invoked his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination in refusing to testify about his Communist Party membership or activities, Mr. Quinn was discharged from Westinghouse Electric Corporation. He was then engaged by the international union in the capacity of UE field organizer.

In testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities on March 11, Mr. Quinn denied that he was now, or had ever been, a member of the Communist Party.

Thomas B. Wright, managing editor of the UE News, was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Louis Budenz in testimony before the Special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor investigating Communist infiltration of the UERMWA in 1948.

Mr. Wright, who has been UE News managing editor since the inception of the publication approximately 20 years ago, estimated the circulation of the UE News to be about 100,000. It is issued every other week and sent to all dues-paying members of the union. He also testified that Julius Emspak and James J. Matles (whose roles as leaders in both the Communist Party and the UE have been described by several former members of the Communist Party in testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities) participate in the operation of the UE News.

Mr. Wright invoked his constitutional privilege against self-incrimination to a number of questions in regard to the Trade Union Service, Inc., a printing firm which prints several Communist-controlled publications and previously printed the UE News.

He denied that he is now a member of the Communist Party, but invoked the first and fifth amendments in refusing to answer questions regarding past party membership.

John W. Nelson has been president of UE Local 506 for the past 15 years. This UE local is the certified bargaining agent for the production and maintenance workers at the Erie plant of the General Electric Company.

On August 11, 1949, during hearings held by the Committee on Un-American Activities regarding the Communist infiltration of labor unions, a sworn affidavit of Richard W. McClellan was introduced into the record in which Mr. McClellan, a former UE official, stated:

John Nelson, the present president of local 506, who was then also a shop steward at the General Electric, was present at that meeting [a Communist cell meeting], took part in the discussion, bought Communist literature and paid party dues. I saw him pay the dues to a woman who was in charge of the meeting and acted as chairman.

In 1953, when testifying before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Mr. Nelson invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions pertaining to his Communist Party membership and activities. Although he was subsequently discharged by General Electric, Mr. Nelson retained the presidency of UE Local 506.

In his testimony during the hearings, John Nelson denied present Communist Party membership. He stated that for the past 10 years he had signed non-Communist affidavits and that if they were false affidavits he was sure the Justice Department would have taken appropriate action. The witness refused to testify to Communist Party membership prior to 1949, declaring that the questions were irrelevant; he did not invoke either the first or fifth amendment.

Robert C. Kirkwood, of Greensburg, Pa., has been business agent for UE Local 610 for the past 10 years and was previously employed by the international union in the capacity of representative.

Mr. Kirkwood denied under oath that he had been a member of the Communist Party since the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1949, when union officers were obliged, under the act, to sign non-Communist oaths annually. His behavior as a witness followed the same pattern as that of the previous witness. He too refused to answer questions regarding Communist Party membership or activities prior to 1949. He based his refusal on the assumption that the questions were not relevant and did not invoke his constitutional privileges.

The final witness before the committee on March 11 was the general counsel of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers Union, Frank Donner.

Several former Communists in testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities have identified Frank Donner as a member of the Communist Party. Mr. Donner had previously appeared as a witness before the committee on June 28, 1956, and invoked the first and fifth amendments to questions regarding his membership and activities in the Communist Party.

At the hearings in Pittsburgh, Mr. Donner testified that he had been general counsel for the union for approximately 18 months. He also testified under oath that he had not been a member of the Communist Party since he appeared before the committee in 1956, but invoked his constitutional privileges and refused to answer questions regarding his party membership or activities prior to that date.

In reply to a question as to whether or not he had resigned technical membership in the party, Mr. Donner declared: "I never resigned and you have no evidence I joined, so there you are."

PROBLEMS ARISING IN CASES OF DENATURALIZATION AND
DEPORTATION OF COMMUNISTS

On March 12,⁸ in pointing up the issues of the hearings in which the committee explored the problems arising in cases of denaturalization and deportation of Communists, the chairman of the subcommittee, Honorable Edwin E. Willis, reviewed the efforts of the international Communist conspiracy toward undermining our immigration and naturalization system. He also stated:

The Committee on Un-American Activities has maintained a continuing interest in the administration and enforcement of our immigration and naturalization laws because they are a first line of defense against Communist penetration of our society. Since the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1952, there have been a number of serious problems develop as the result of certain judicial opinions interpreting the act.

It is not my purpose here to criticize the opinions or the Court which rendered them. However in order that we may attempt to cope with the problems which do now exist in the enforcement of those provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act designed to denaturalize and deport Communists, I shall now recite for the record the essence of some of these judicial opinions; and we shall then undertake to explore factual situations in actual cases in which there have been either deportation or denaturalization proceedings arising in, or having bearing on, cases in the Pittsburgh area.

On December 9, 1957, the Supreme Court rendered a decision in the case of *Rowaldt v. Perfetto*, 355 U.S. 115. In this case the Court held that where the Department of Justice was attempting to deport a Communist alien, proof of the alien's membership in the Communist Party was not sufficient to sustain the order of deportation; that the Department of Justice had to prove that the alien had "a meaningful association" with the Communist Party.

In the case of the *United States v. Witkovich*, 353 U.S. 194, decided on April 29, 1957, the Supreme Court interpreted that part of the Immigration and Nationality Act which requires that an alien against whom a deportation order has been outstanding for more than 6 months "give information under oath as to his nationality, circumstances, habits, associations and activities, and such other information, whether or not related to the foregoing, as the Attorney General may deem fit and proper." In this case, by a 6 to 2 decision, the Court held that an alien against whom a deportation order had been outstanding for more than 6 months could not be required to answer questions respecting his present Communist relationships or activities, and that he could only be required to answer questions regarding his availability for deportation.

May I say in connection with the problem which is presented by the Witkovich case that it is the information of the

⁸ See "Problems Arising in Cases of Denaturalization and Deportation of Communists (Greater Pittsburgh Area—Part 3)," Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities, March 12, 1959.

committee that it is becoming increasingly difficult to effect the deportation of alien Communists because the Iron Curtain countries from which such alien Communists have come to the United States almost uniformly refuse to issue necessary travel documents pursuant to which they can be admitted into the countries from which they came.

Turning to the problems of denaturalizing Communists, I should like to refer to two judicial opinions. Here again I want to emphasize that I am not criticizing the opinions or the Court, but I am merely pointing out the issues and problems which exist as a result of the opinions, and I am doing so for the purposes of clarifying our record here today as we enter this third phase of our hearings in an attempt to explore factual situations for our legislative purposes.

In the cases of *Nowak v. United States*, 356 U.S. 660, and *Maisenberg v. United States*, 356 U.S. 670, both decided on May 26, 1958, the Court ruled that for the purposes of denaturalizing a Communist who had obtained citizenship while a member of the Communist Party, the Government must not only show that the person against whom the denaturalization procedures were brought was a member of the Communist Party and that the Communist Party advocates the violent overthrow of the Government, but that, in addition, the Government must prove that the defendant knew that the Communist Party actually engaged in such illegal advocacy. The decision in the Nowak case was another split decision of which the Maisenberg case was a companion.

The subcommittee sought to determine what legislation ought to be and could be enacted to strengthen our deportation and denaturalization proceedings in the light of these decisions; to find out if the persons against whom these proceedings have been brought are now a menace to the security of this country; and what type of factual material may be developed in deportation cases to overcome the impact of these opinions.

Seven witnesses who had been involved in deportation or denaturalization proceedings in the Pittsburgh area were heard by the committee in order to develop information on these questions.

Their cases are typical of individuals who have been repeatedly found to be members of the Communist Party but against whom this Government appears to be powerless, at the present time under the present law, to proceed in causing their removal from the United States or causing them to be deprived of citizenship.

Testimony during the hearings was given by Hamp and Mary Golden respecting the current Communist Party membership and activity of all seven witnesses.

Vincent Kemenovich, of Trafford, Pa., invoked the first and fifth amendments, refusing to answer questions concerning his Communist Party membership and activities.

According to the records of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, a warrant was issued in September 1949 for the arrest and deportation of Vincent Kemenovich as an alien Communist who, after entry, was a member of a group advocating overthrow of the Government by force and violence. A hearing was granted, and on

January 9, 1951, he was ordered deported. At that time the Immigration Service produced testimony from five competent witnesses respecting his Communist Party affiliations and activity. An appeal was taken on July 6, 1951, and on January 14, 1952, a warrant of deportation was issued.

It is the information of the committee that Mr. Kemenovich's deportation as an alien Communist has not been effected because of difficulty in procuring travel documents for his admission into the Iron Curtain country from which he came.

Mrs. Katherine Kemenovich, Trafford, Pa., the wife of Vincent Kemenovich, testified that she was born in Austria-Hungary (now Yugoslavia); that she came to the United States for permanent residence in 1921; and that she was naturalized in Steubenville, Ohio, in 1941. Although she was identified as a member of the Communist Party and testimony was received during the hearings respecting her current party activities, Mrs. Kemenovich invoked constitutional privileges in response to questions concerning her Communist Party membership and activities and whether, at the time of her naturalization, she was cognizant of the fact that the Communist Party advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence.

In 1954, the Immigration and Naturalization Service instituted proceedings to revoke Mrs. Kemenovich's citizenship, alleging that it was procured illegally, in that she concealed at the time of her naturalization the fact that she was then a member of the Communist Party.

The Supreme Court of the United States, having held that Section 340(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 makes the filing of an "affidavit showing good cause" a prerequisite to maintenance of a denaturalization case, *United States v. Zucca*, 1956, 351 U.S. 91, the Katherine Kemenovich case was dismissed without prejudice, there having been a failure to file such an affidavit. Before the proceeding could be reinstituted, the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States came down in the Nowak and Maisenberg cases. Due to the problem of proving knowledge on the part of Mrs. Kemenovich that the Communist Party advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence at the time of her naturalization, as required by the decisions in those cases, the proceeding was not reinstituted.

Alex Roth Rakosi, Irwin, Pa., came to the United States from his native Hungary in 1923 and received his United States citizenship in 1940. In testimony before the committee, Mr. Rakosi invoked his constitutional privileges, refusing to answer questions pertaining to his Communist Party membership and activities either before or since denaturalization proceedings against him were dismissed in April 1958.

The committee's information shows that on May 5, 1954, a complaint was filed in the United States District Court in Pittsburgh, alleging that Mr. Rakosi had procured citizenship illegally, in that he concealed from the Government that he was a member of the Communist Party at the time of his naturalization.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service had witnesses of proven integrity who were prepared to testify under oath that they knew Rakosi as a member of the Communist Party at the time he took the oath. However, because of certain judicial decisions which had in the meantime been handed down, it was virtually impossible for the Government to proceed with the case.

James Allan Donald McNeil was excused after very brief testimony because a hearing pertaining to his deportation as an alien Communist was scheduled for April 20, before the Immigration Service.

Anna Devunich, Pittsburgh, Pa., was born in Austria-Hungary, came to the United States in 1927, and became a naturalized citizen in 1944. On May 5, 1954, a complaint was filed in the United States District Court in Pittsburgh to revoke her citizenship on the ground that she was a member of the Communist Party when she filed a petition for citizenship in 1943 and had been a party member since approximately 1930.

Mary Golden testified to Anna Devunich's current Communist Party activities and identified her as the one who had recruited Mrs. Golden into the party.

When Mrs. Devunich appeared as a witness, she was confronted with numerous exhibits of Communist-front activities, but she invoked the privilege of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination in response to all questions respecting her Communist Party membership and activities.

Stephen Devunich, husband of Anna Devunich, is also a naturalized citizen. He, too, was born in Austria-Hungary and came to the United States in 1927.

According to the information of the committee, Mr. Devunich filed a petition for naturalization in the United States District Court, Pittsburgh, Pa., on March 25, 1940. He was admitted to citizenship on March 23, 1943, at which time he took an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic and swore that he was not then, and never had been, a member of an organization dedicated to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence.

On May 5, 1954, proceedings were instituted to revoke Mr. Devunich's citizenship on the grounds that he was at the time of filing the petition, and had been since approximately 1930, a member of the Communist Party.

In testimony before the committee, Mr. Devunich invoked the privilege of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination with respect to all questions in regard to his Communist Party membership and activities.

Steve Nelson, whose record of Communist activity in the United States is notorious, is a naturalized citizen against whom denaturalization proceedings have been unsuccessful. He invoked the privilege of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination with respect to his knowledge of the nature of the Communist Party at the time of his naturalization. Although both Hamp and Mary Golden testified respecting current Communist Party membership and activities of Steve Nelson, he invoked the privilege of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination when interrogated respecting such membership and activities.

The denaturalization proceedings which were instituted against Alex Roth Rakosi, Anna Devunich, Stephen Devunich, and Steve Nelson were all dismissed without prejudice for the same reason that the Katherine Kemenovich case was dismissed, and the proceedings were not reinstituted [for the same reason that this case was not reinstituted.

Their cases are typical of those of numerous persons who have been identified as being Communists at the time of their naturalization by competent witnesses testifying under oath. Furthermore, such individuals have also been known to engage in Communist Party activities both before and after they were granted citizenship. However, because of the legal difficulties stemming from certain judicial opinions, their cases have been dismissed.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF VITAL INDUSTRIES CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

* * * *In trade unions it is necessary to form Communist nuclei which, by means of long and persistent work, must win the trade unions for the cause of communism.*
* * * *These Communist nuclei must be entirely subordinated to the party as a whole.*—*Lenin*

That the above Leninist policy is still in operation was borne out by the testimony which the Committee on Un-American Activities received in public hearings held in Chicago, Illinois, on May 5, 6, and 7, 1959.⁹

The committee, continuing its investigation of Communist techniques and tactics of infiltration and the extent, character, and objects of Communist Party propaganda activities in industry, obtained significant information from a number of witnesses, the first being Carl Nelson, of Chicago.

Mr. Nelson testified that from 1934 through 1949 he was a member of the Communist Party and was in ideological sympathy with it; that after his severance from the formal Communist Party, he continued to serve the Communist operation until approximately 1954 or 1955, principally in front groups.

In his testimony, Carl Nelson emphasized that the formal entity known as the Communist Party is only one segment of the total Communist operation in the United States and that, in order to avoid the impact of certain laws, Communists often resign technical membership in the formal Communist Party but continue in the Communist operation. With respect to this Communist policy, Mr. Nelson testified as follows:

Mr. ARENS. During the period in 1948 of the passage in the 80th Congress of amendments to the National Labor Relations Act, requiring certain officials to sign non-Communist affidavits, to your certain knowledge, did certain people resign from the formal entity known as the Communist Party and maintain themselves in the Communist operation?

Mr. NELSON. They did.

Mr. ARENS. Did they do that so that they could take a non-Communist affidavit in order to avoid the impact of the then existing law?

Mr. NELSON. That is right.

Based upon his experience in various Communist units in the meat-packing industry in the Greater Chicago area, Mr. Nelson stated the Communist Party deliberately sought to infiltrate its members into the

⁹ See "Communist Infiltration of Vital Industries and Current Communist Techniques in the Chicago, Ill., Area," Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities, May 5-7, 1959.

meatpacking industry. The witness explained the motive of the Communist Party as follows:

Well, if this country was ever to go to war, an army has to travel on its stomach, and they would be in an excellent position to cut off food for the Armed Forces.

In the course of his testimony, Mr. Nelson detailed Communist strategy and tactics in penetrating the meatpacking industry. He identified a number of persons in this industry who, to his certain knowledge, were members of the Communist Party.

Leslie Orear, of Chicago, who had been identified by Carl Nelson as a member of the Communist Party, appeared in response to a subpoena and testified that he was the editor of *The Packinghouse Worker*, official organ of the United Packinghouse Workers of America; that he was not currently a member of the Communist Party; and that he had not been a member of the Communist Party since approximately 1953.

However, Mr. Orear invoked the fifth amendment and refused to answer whether he held membership in the Communist Party prior to 1953. He asserted that he had, at the time of the hearing, a strong antipathy to the Communist Party; but he declined to answer whether he knew the names of persons in the Chicago area who were members of the Communist Party in 1952, basing his declination on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him.

Leon Beverly, who had been identified by Carl Nelson as a member of the Communist Party, appeared in response to a subpoena and testified that he was field representative for the United Packinghouse Workers. He denied current membership in the Communist Party but invoked his constitutional privileges and declined to answer if he had resigned technical membership in the Communist Party so that he could deny membership and yet maintain himself in the Communist operation.

Samuel J. Parks, Jr., who had been identified by Carl Nelson as a member of the Communist Party, appeared in response to a subpoena and testified that for 3 years prior to April 1957 he was director of a department of the United Packinghouse Workers. He denied current membership in the Communist Party but refused to answer whether he resigned technical membership in the Communist Party so that he could deny, under oath, current membership while remaining in the Communist operation, basing his refusal on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him.

Jack Souther, of Chicago, who had been identified by Carl Nelson as a member of the Communist Party, appeared in response to a subpoena and testified that he was secretary-treasurer of District 1, United Packinghouse Workers of America. Although he denied current membership in the Communist Party, he refused to state whether he had ever been a member of the Communist Party and refused to answer whether he had resigned technical membership in the Communist Party but maintained himself in the Communist operation, basing his refusal on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him.

Mrs. Gloria Wailes, of Chicago, who had been identified by Carl Nelson as a member of the Communist Party, appeared in response to a subpoena and testified that she was employed as a secretary in the

international office of the United Packinghouse Workers of America. She denied current membership in the Communist Party but refused to answer whether she had ever been a member of the Communist Party and whether she had resigned technical membership in the Communist Party but maintained herself in the Communist operation, basing her refusal on the ground that her answers might tend to incriminate her.

Joseph Zabritski, of Chicago, who had been identified by Carl Nelson as a member of the Communist Party, appeared in response to a subpoena and testified that he had been one-time president of Local 25, United Packinghouse Workers of America. Mr. Zabritski denied current membership in the Communist Party, but refused to answer whether he had resigned technical membership in the Communist Party but maintained himself in the Communist operation, basing his refusal on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him.

John R. Hackney, an international representative for the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, testified that he had been a member of the Communist Party from approximately 1942 to 1948. He said that, being a member of the Negro race, he joined the Communist Party because he believed the party was the spearhead of the rights of the Negro people. Mr. Hackney broke with the Communist Party, however, upon realizing the insincerity of the Communists.

The motive for Communist penetration of the meat industry, Mr. Hackney stated, was:

Because the party felt that the meat industry was essential to the national economy and it was important that they build the party within the meat industry in the event that we had war with other nations, that we could control the meat industry and its various outlets.

He continued:

From my most current information and my experience in my activity in the party I would say that the party is stronger now in the meat industry than it ever has been.

Mr. Hackney corroborated the testimony of Carl Nelson to the effect that Communists frequently employed the technique of resigning technical membership in the formal Communist Party in order to avoid the impact of certain laws but continue in the Communist operation. With respect to this Communist technique, Mr. Hackney testified:

Mr. ARENS. Now, yesterday, and I am using this only from the standpoint of a simple illustration for the record which we are making today, yesterday we heard witnesses, some of whom had been identified as members of the Communist Party. When they appeared before this committee they said in effect that they were not then members of the Communist Party. When I asked them if they resigned technical membership in the formal entity known as the Communist Party in order to maintain themselves in the Communist operation, they refused to give us responses.

Do you have any recommendations, based upon your background and information, which could establish a criterion or test that can be applied to determine whether or not a person who has resigned from technical membership in the formal entity known as the Communist Party is, in truth and in fact, out of the conspiracy?

Mr. HACKNEY. In my opinion if a person has resigned completely from the Communist Party he would come before this committee and he would say so and he would testify, the same as I am, and as far as experience I have had with members of the Communist Party resigning for technical reasons, I can cite you one particular case that comes in my mind and that was in the 1948 convention here in the city of Chicago.

There was a caucus meeting held of top party officials and for the purpose of deciding who was to resign from the party because of the refusal to sign the Taft-Hartley oath and in one particular case there was Meyer Stern, the district director of District 6 in New York, whom I knew to be a member of the party, and to my surprise I learned that he had resigned from the party the night before the election of officers took place and that he was now eligible to run for office and be reelected a district director of District 6 because he was now not a member of the party and free to sign a non-Communist affidavit.

Mr. ARENS. Did he maintain himself for all intents and purposes as an active member of the conspiracy?

Mr. HACKNEY. Yes.

In the course of his testimony Mr. Hackney, who had served as a Communist in a number of Communist units within the meatpacking industry, detailed party strategy and tactics in penetrating the meatpacking industry and identified a number of persons in the meatpacking industry who, to his certain knowledge, were members of the Communist Party.

Charles A. Hayes, of Chicago, who had been identified by John Hackney, appeared in response to a subpoena and testified that he was director of District 1 of the United Packinghouse Workers, which includes the Chicago area. Mr. Hayes denied current membership in the Communist Party but declined to answer whether he had been a member of the Communist Party since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law requiring a non-Communist affidavit of certain labor officials, or whether he resigned technical membership in the Communist Party so that he could avoid the impact of that law. He based his declination on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him. Charles A. Hayes was also identified as a member of the Communist Party by Carl Nelson, who stated that he had attended many Communist Party meetings with Mr. Hayes.

Rachael Carter Ellis, of Chicago, secretary to Charles A. Hayes, director of District 1 of the United Packinghouse Workers, appeared in response to a subpoena. She had previously been identified in these hearings by Carl Nelson and John R. Hackney as a member of the Communist Party. She denied current membership in the Communist Party but refused to answer whether she had been a member of the Communist Party during the preceding 2 years and whether

she resigned technical membership in the Communist Party but maintained herself in the Communist operation, basing her refusals on the ground that her answers might tend to incriminate her.

Leo Turner, of Chicago, who had been identified by Carl Nelson as a member of the Communist Party, appeared in response to a subpoena and testified that he was a field representative of the United Packinghouse Workers of America. He denied current membership in the Communist Party but refused to answer whether he resigned technical membership in the Communist Party but maintained himself in the Communist operation, basing his refusal on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him.

On May 7, 1959, Joseph A. Poskonka, of Chicago, testified that he was currently in the Communist operation. From 1943 to 1948 he was a member of that part of the Communist operation known as the Communist Party. At no time had he ever been in sympathy with the Communist Party or Communist principles; his service in the Communist operation was solely at the behest, and with the cooperation, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the purpose of supplying information to the Government. With respect to the current seriousness of the Communist operation in the United States, Mr. Poskonka testified:

Mr. ARENS. I expect to interrogate you on several items in the course of your testimony this morning, but I should like at the outset to ask you first of all, based upon your background and experience since 1943 until this instant in the Communist operation and your participation in the Communist Party as a formal entity, to tell this committee now, while you are under oath, how serious is the Communist movement, the Communist operation in the United States this instant.

Mr. POSKONKA. It is very, very serious.

Mr. Poskonka, who served for several years in the packinghouse segment of the Communist Party, testified respecting Communist penetration of the packinghouse industry in the Greater Chicago area. In the course of his testimony Mr. Poskonka detailed Communist strategy in penetrating the meatpacking industry and identified a number of persons in the meatpacking industry who, to his certain knowledge, were members of the Communist Party.

John Lewis, of Chicago, who was identified by Carl Nelson, John Hackney, and Joseph Poskonka during these hearings as a person known by them to be a member of the Communist Party, appeared in response to a subpoena and testified that he was employed in the Swift packing plant in Chicago and that he held a number of offices in Local 28 of the United Packinghouse Workers of America.

Mr. Lewis denied current membership in the Communist Party but refused to answer if he had ever been a member of the Communist Party and if he had resigned technical membership in the Communist Party so that he could deny current membership in the Communist Party, if and when interrogated under oath. He based his refusal on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him.

Charles Proctor, of Covert, Michigan, who had been identified as a member of the Communist Party during the instant hearings by Carl Nelson, John Hackney, and Joseph Poskonka, appeared in response

to a subpoena and testified that he was manager of the Packinghouse Labor and Community Center and that he was one-time chairman of the grievance committee for Local 28 of the United Packinghouse Workers in Chicago. When a number of documents were exhibited to Mr. Proctor respecting his participation in certain Communist-front enterprises, he refused to comment, basing his refusal on the ground that his answers might tend to incriminate him. Mr. Proctor denied that he had been a member of the Communist Party any time in the course of the preceding 5 years, but he refused to answer whether he had ever been a member of the Communist Party on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him.

Donald H. Smith, of Chicago, who had been identified in these hearings by Carl Nelson and John Hackney as a person known to them as a member of the Communist Party, appeared in response to a subpoena and testified that he was employed as international representative, United Packinghouse Workers of America. Mr. Smith denied current membership in the Communist Party but declined to answer if he had been a member of the Communist Party in the course of the last 5 years, basing his declination on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him.

Another witness heard during the course of the Chicago hearings was Jesse E. Prosten, who was identified during the hearings as a member of the Communist Party by Carl Nelson, John Hackney, and Joseph A. Poskonka. Mr. Prosten testified that he was an international representative for the United Packinghouse Workers of America. He denied current membership in the Communist Party but refused to answer whether he had been a member of the Communist Party at any time within the course of the preceding 5 years, basing his refusal on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him.

The committee also heard as witnesses two other Chicago residents who were identified during the hearings by Carl Nelson as members of the Communist Party.

Leon Katzen, whom Mr. Nelson had known as section organizer of the Communist Party in Chicago's northwest side, invoked the first and fifth amendments in refusing to answer committee questions, not only pertaining to Communist activities but also pertaining to his occupation. Richard Criley, whom Mr. Nelson said he knew as a member of the section committee of the Communist Party in the packinghouse industry, also invoked constitutional privileges in response to all pertinent questions posed by the committee. According to committee information, Mr. Katzen has served as chairman of the Chicago Committee to Defend Democratic Rights, and Mr. Criley has served as executive secretary of the same organization.

The committee also subpoenaed four witnesses currently or recently employed in the machinists trade in the Chicago area.

Albert P. Dency, a tool and die maker in Chicago, appeared in response to a subpoena. Although Mr. Dency was confronted with the information of the committee that he had been a member of the Communist Party in Waukegan, Ill., in 1949, 1950, and 1951, he denied that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party or that he had been knowingly under the discipline of the Communist Party. In denying Communist Party membership and associations, Mr. Dency did not invoke constitutional privileges. During June

1959 the committee referred Mr. Dency's testimony to the Department of Justice for such investigation as it may deem pertinent in determining whether or not perjury was committed.

The next witness, Francis William McBain, of Chicago, appeared in response to a subpoena and testified that he was a model maker. Mr. McBain refused to answer whether he was currently a member of the Communist Party, basing his refusal on a number of grounds, including the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him.

Edwin A. Alexander, of Chicago, appeared in response to a subpoena and detailed his career in the Communist Party, which, with interruptions, extended from 1934 until 1956. Mr. Alexander said he was a paid official of the Young Communist League, operating in California, Washington State, Oregon, and New York in the 1930's and that he graduated to full-time functionary work for the Communist Party in Seattle in the 1940's. From 1951 until 1956, he said, he engaged in Communist Party activities in Chicago, where he was employed as a machinist and tool and die maker. Mr. Alexander's testimony included a narrative of his activities in various Communist enterprises. He refused, however, to disclose the identity of persons who, as of 1956, were known by him to be members of the Communist Party. In refusing to answer questions regarding such persons, Mr. Alexander invoked all his constitutional privileges "except that portion of the fifth amendment which speaks of protection against self-incrimination." On June 3, 1959, the committee voted to recommend to the House of Representatives that Edwin A. Alexander be cited for contempt. The committee recommendation was adopted by the House of Representatives on September 3, 1959.

Bernard Angert, of Evanston, Ill., appeared in response to a subpoena and testified that he was a moldmaker in the machinists trade, although he had 4 or 5 years of college education. Mr. Angert refused to answer whether he was currently a member of the Communist Party and whether he was currently engaged in Communist Party work in the International Association of Machinists as a colonizer, basing his refusal on the ground, among others, that his answers might tend to incriminate him.

The term "colonizer," in Communist Party jargon, designates a Communist agent, frequently highly educated, who conceals his background and takes a menial job in a specific industry for the purpose of building a party unit in that industry.

PASSPORT SECURITY

In opening the hearings on passport security¹⁰ which were held in Washington beginning on April 21, 1959, the chairman of the committee stated:

Since the last hearings on this subject matter by this committee, the Supreme Court of the United States on June 16, 1958, in the case of *Rockwell Kent and Walter Briehl v. The Secretary of State*, has rendered a decision the effect of which is to completely nullify any control on a security basis in the issuance of passports.

¹⁰ See "Passport Security," Parts 1 and 2, Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities, April 21 and April 22-24-June 5, 1959, respectively.

Today, now, the bars are down. Communist agents, propagandists, and Communist sympathizers have a blanket invitation to come and go as they will. I hardly need add a statement, which is obvious, namely, that this situation is of direct benefit to the international Communist movement, and of direct detriment to security interests of our Nation.

The first witness, Mr. Harry Bridges, appeared in response to a subpoena and identified himself as president of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union.¹¹ At the outset of the interrogation, Mr. Bridges invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer a question as to whether or not he had ever used the name Harry Dorgan which, according to Agnes Bridges, former wife of Harry Bridges, was the name inscribed in Bridges' Communist Party membership book.

Mr. Bridges testified that on July 16, 1958, he had filed an application for a passport; that in filling out the application he omitted answers to two questions: "Are you now a member of the Communist Party?" and "Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?" because of recent decisions of the Supreme Court. In response to the query as to whether on the date of filing his application he was "a person who had ever been a member of the Communist Party," Mr. Bridges replied: "I must decline to answer, and I seek the protection of the fifth amendment."

The testimony discloses that Mr. Bridges, accompanied by William Glazier, executive assistant to the officers of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, at the expense of ILWU, later traveled to Europe for the purpose of "travel, recreation, and study of longshoring methods and collective bargaining." Although the passport application listed the countries to be visited as England, France, Italy, Holland, Israel, Egypt, U.S.S.R., and India, the itinerary included certain Iron Curtain countries not listed on the application. During his trip abroad, Mr. Bridges participated in a number of conferences with leading European Communists and gave interviews and issued statements to various Communist publications, commending the Communist controlled labor organizations in the Iron Curtain countries. He also sent to the United States a series of articles in similar vein which were published in *The Dispatcher*, official publication of the ILWU.

Mr. Bridges testified that shortly after the hearings he expected to go to Tokyo, Japan, on a United States passport to participate in the First All-Pacific and Asian Dockworkers' Trade Union Conference. This was a Communist-initiated and promoted gathering identified as such by the Japanese Government and denounced and boycotted as such by free trade unions in all parts of the world. Because of Bridges' subsequent participation as a leader in this conference at which a permanent organization of Communist and pro-Communist dockworkers' unions in the Asian-Pacific area was formed, the following excerpt from his testimony before the committee is significant.

MR. ARENS. In the event of war in Asia would you advocate a strike for the purpose of impeding the shipment of arms to our allies in Asia?

¹¹ Expelled from the CIO in 1950 on the ground of "Communist domination."

Mr. BRIDGES. Now, this is all mixed up here. We start off by talking about a fight between Chiang Kai-shek, who I think is a bum, and the mainland of China. That is something between the Chinese, and you asked me my position on that.

Mr. ARENS. Would you advocate a strike in order to curtail the shipment of supplies in the event the U.S. Government would ship arms to Formosa?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. BRIDGES. Are you still talking about a war between Formosa and mainland China and you asked me what my position was?

Mr. ARENS. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would object in every possible way I could. You are asking me. Then you asked me—

Mr. ARENS. No, let's just stay with the question, Mr. Bridges. Would you, as president of ILWU, advocate a strike in order to impede the shipments of supplies to Formosa if the U.S. Government were shipping supplies to Formosa and Formosa and Red China were at war?

Mr. BRIDGES. I don't know what this has got to do with passports. But I want to relate to you the position—

Mr. ARENS. Would you kindly answer the question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I will answer it in my way, Mr. Counsel, if you want an answer and if you will give me a chance.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question.

Mr. BRIDGES. All right. We are still dealing with a possible attempt, as I understand it, of Chiang Kai-shek to invade the mainland of China. I am trying to tell you that my attitude toward that, I would strenuously object and do what I could to oppose the United States engaging in such a suicide enterprise.

Mr. ARENS. Would you kindly answer the question? Would you exercise your prerogatives as president of ILWU in the direction of using a strike of longshoremen so as to impede the shipments of these armaments which we have been discussing?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no such prerogative. You are all mixed up.

Mr. ARENS. Would you advocate a strike?

Mr. BRIDGES. I would prefer to wait and see what would happen at that time. I don't know. At this stage of the game I don't know what I might do.

If I felt doing that would keep the United States from going into such a suicidal enterprise and meaning the loss of life in the United States my position at the moment would be, I think I would.

Finally, attention is drawn to the following testimony:

Mr. ARENS. You have a U.S. passport, however?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do.

Mr. ARENS. Had you ever applied for a U.S. passport prior to the Kent-Briehl decision?

Mr. BRIDGES. No, Mr. Arens. There was too many people in this country trying to get me out without a passport— * * *

William L. Patterson, general manager of the official Communist Party newspaper, *The Worker*, appeared in response to a subpoena.

Mr. Patterson recounted his education and his principal employments prior to becoming general manager of *The Worker* in 1958. Although Mr. Patterson in a letter addressed to the chairman of the committee respecting the hearings had identified himself as a Communist, he refused to respond when asked if he was currently a Communist.

Mr. Patterson testified that in 1927 he procured a United States passport with which he traveled to a number of foreign countries, including Soviet Russia, where he spent considerable time. He declined, however, to answer questions respecting Communist activities on the trip. Thereafter, in 1934 and again in 1948, Mr. Patterson procured a United States passport with which he traveled abroad. Passport applications at the time did not request information as to whether or not the applicant was a member of the Communist Party.

Although Mr. Patterson did not reveal in his passport application in 1948 that he proposed to visit Hungary, he, nevertheless, visited that country and, while there, issued statements attacking the Government of the United States.

Thereafter, Mr. Patterson's passport was taken up by the State Department because he had violated the ban on travel to Hungary.

In July 1958, Mr. Patterson filed another passport application. At the time, the passport application contained a question inquiring if the applicant had ever been a member of the Communist Party. Mr. Patterson did not answer the question.

Mr. Patterson testified as follows:

Mr. PATTERSON. I didn't answer that question because the State Department correctly, under the decision of the Supreme Court, held that it was not—that the question could be evaded and, therefore, under the State Department's position and the Supreme Court's decision in the case of Kent and Briehl, the cases of Rockwell Kent and Briehl, I am of the political opinion of others that whether you are a Republican, Democrat, Socialist, or what have you, it was not necessary nor within the province of the State Department to inquire.

* * * * *

Mr. ARENS. Was a passport issued to you pursuant to this application which you filed several months ago?

Mr. PATTERSON. It was.

Mr. ARENS. And you now have in your possession a United States passport issued to you pursuant to this application made in July of 1958; is that correct?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. ARENS. Now, may I ask you, as of the instant that you affixed your signature to this passport application in July of 1958, were you then a member of the Communist Party?

(Witness confers with his counsel.)

* * * *

Mr. PATTERSON. * * *. Mr. Staff Director, it is not within your province to ask that question any more than it was the province of the State Department, as held by the Supreme Court. Therefore, with authority of the Supreme Court, I decline, and, of course, under the Constitution, I decline to answer that question.

Mr. SCHERER. I ask that he be directed to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. You are directed to answer the question, Mr. Patterson.

Mr. PATTERSON. I decline.

Mr. ARENS. Where do you intend to go on your passport and when?

Mr. PATTERSON. It would be impossible for me to answer such a question, because I don't know.

Casimir T. Nowacki, of New York City, appeared in response to a subpoena. He refused to give his occupation, basing his refusal on the ground, among others, that his answer might tend to incriminate him.

The evidence reveals that in 1949 Mr. Nowacki procured a United States passport with which he traveled to Poland and that the application he filed for it did not ask the applicant whether or not he was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. Nowacki refused to respond to questions as to whether his expenses to Poland in 1949 were paid by the Communist Party and whether he had attended a special training course for Communists in Warsaw during his stay there. Mr. Nowacki testified that in 1956 he filed another application for a United States passport which was issued to him. Shortly thereafter he received a letter from the Department of State requesting him to submit, under oath or affirmation, a statement with respect to present or past membership in the Communist Party and notifying him that, pending receipt of the statement, his passport was withdrawn.

The testimony reveals that, notwithstanding his receipt of this letter, Mr. Nowacki attempted to depart from the United States with the passport in his possession. His passport was seized on the ship's gangplank by Department of State officials.

Mr. Nowacki refused to state whether he was a member of the Communist Party at the time he procured his passport in 1956. He likewise refused to reveal the source of his expenses for his proposed trip and the objective and purpose of it.

In November 1958, Mr. Nowacki filed another passport application which contained a question as to whether the applicant was a member of the Communist Party. Mr. Nowacki did not answer the question. The passport was issued to him shortly thereafter. Mr. Nowacki was confronted in the course of the hearings with committee information and exhibits respecting his membership in the Communist Party and his varied Communist activities. He refused to respond to these questions. He likewise declined to say whether he was at the time of the hearings a member of the Communist Party.

Dorothy Ray Friedman, of Providence, R.I., the next witness, also appeared in response to a subpoena.

In earlier hearings of the committee held in Boston, Mass., in March 1958, Armando Penha, who for a number of years had been an FBI undercover agent in the Communist Party, had identified Mrs. Friedman as a person known by him to be a Communist. Subpenaed to testify in the Boston hearings, Mrs. Friedman refused to answer any questions respecting her Communist Party membership or activities.

Thereafter, in July 1958, Mrs. Friedman filed an application with the Department of State for a United States passport. She refused to answer the question on the application as to whether she was a member of the Communist Party, but a passport was issued to her.

In the instant hearings Mrs. Friedman refused to answer any questions, except to give her name, residence, and occupation, basing her refusal on the ground, among others, that her answers might incriminate her.

Fred Paul Muller, of Hoboken, N.J., appeared in response to a subpoena but refused to answer any questions except to give his name and place of residence, basing his refusal on the ground, among others, that his answers might incriminate him. There were displayed to Mr. Muller photostatic reproductions of passport applications filed by him with the Department of State in August 1950, September 1954, and July 1958, respectively, and Mr. Muller was confronted with information of the committee that in 1956 he had been cited by the international Communist apparatus for doing "fine international work for the party." Mr. Muller persisted in his refusal to answer all questions relating to Communist activities.

Bocho Mircheff, of Detroit, Mich., appeared in response to a subpoena. He refused to state his occupation on the ground, among others, that to do so would be to supply information that might be used against him in a criminal proceeding. Mr. Mircheff testified that he was born in Bulgaria and became a naturalized citizen in Detroit in 1938.

Mr. Mircheff was shown a photostatic reproduction of a passport application filed by him with the Department of State in 1946 and was interrogated respecting the trip he made to Bulgaria at that time. He refused to answer any questions respecting the trip on the ground, among others, that to do so would give information which could be used against him in a criminal proceeding. There was also displayed to Mr. Mircheff a photostatic reproduction of a passport application filed by him with the Department of State in June 1958, in which application he omitted filling out questions respecting membership in the Communist Party. He refused to state whether he was a member of the Communist Party at the time he filed the application for a passport in June 1958, and whether he was a member of the Communist Party at the instant of his testimony.

Mr. Mircheff was scheduled to go abroad shortly after the hearings. He refused to say whether his expenses would be paid by persons known by him to be members of the Communist Party, whether his mission abroad was under the direction of the Communist Party, and whether he expected to engage in Communist Party activities after he arrived in Bulgaria.

Leonore Haimowitz, of Plainfield, N.J., appeared in response to a subpoena. She was shown a photostatic reproduction of an applica-

tion filed by her with the Department of State in 1949 for a passport to go to Europe. She refused to answer any questions respecting the passport application on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate her. Mrs. Haimowitz was confronted with committee information to the effect that in 1954, as a then member of the Communist Party, she had engaged in Communist Party activities in Mexico. She refused to answer questions respecting the subject matter on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate her.

Mrs. Haimowitz was next shown a copy of the passport application for travel to Europe filed by her with the Department of State in July 1958. She refused to answer all questions respecting the passport application and to say whether or not a passport was issued pursuant to the application, although the application showed that a passport was issued on September 10, 1958. She based her refusal on the ground that if she answered the question she would be giving information which could be used against her in a criminal proceeding. Mrs. Haimowitz likewise refused on the same ground to answer whether she was a member of the Communist Party at the very moment of her testimony.

Stanley Nowak, of Detroit, Mich., appeared in response to a subpoena. He stated that his occupation was "journalism" but, in response to a question as to where he was employed, declined to answer. He gave as a reason, among others, "I also want to claim at this time the privilege of the fifth amendment."

In an opinion of the Supreme Court on May 26, 1958, in the case of the *United States v. Stanley Nowak* (the witness) the Court stated that the Government had proved that Nowak was a member of the Communist Party. Mr. Nowak testified that thereafter in July 1958, he filed a passport application with the Department of State but that he did not fill out the questions on the application form respecting Communist Party membership "because it was not necessary according to the decision of the Supreme Court."

Mr. Nowak declined to state whether, at the instant he had affixed his signature to the application form, he was a member of the Communist Party. He likewise declined to state who paid his expenses on a trip to Poland he had made on a United States passport in September 1958, basing his declination on the ground, among others, that his answer might incriminate him.

Arthur David Kahn, of Brooklyn, N.Y., appeared in response to a subpoena but refused to answer any questions of the committee "on the basis of the fifth amendment," except to give his name and address.

There were displayed to Mr. Kahn a series of passport applications and applications for renewal filed by him with the Department of State beginning in 1944, pursuant to which he had obtained passports or renewals for travel abroad, including a passport application filed under date of July 23, 1958, pursuant to which a passport was issued on August 25, 1958.

Mr. Kahn was confronted with committee information to the effect that, over the course of many years' time as a member of the Communist Party, he had participated in a number of Communist activities and that, while serving with the OSS of the United States Government in Germany, he was in contact with German Communists for the purpose of conducting Communist Party operations.

The record reveals that Mr. Kahn had been refused United States passports on numerous occasions on security grounds but that, after the decision of the Supreme Court in the Kent-Briehl case, a passport was issued to him.

Victor Perlo, of New York City, appeared in response to a subpoena and stated that he was an economist. He was shown a passport application filed by him with the Department of State in 1947 in which he had stated that he sought a passport to go to London. The passport application was denied. Thereafter, in 1950, Mr. Perlo filed another passport application with the Department of State seeking a passport to go to France, Belgium, Italy, and England for "research and travel." This passport application, likewise, was denied.

Mr. Perlo had been identified before this committee in 1948 as the leader of a Communist cell in the United States Government which had been collecting information for the benefit of the Soviet Union. When Mr. Perlo filed another passport application in July of 1958, he received from the Department of State a letter stating that the Department "has received information indicating that you have been a member and a leader of an espionage group and that you have actively engaged in espionage activities on behalf of a foreign government." The letter requested him to answer a series of questions respecting his activities. Subsequent to receipt of the letter from the Department of State, Mr. Perlo sent a letter to the Department respecting his proposed trip, but did not answer the questions of the Department as to whether he had engaged in espionage.

Mr. Perlo, in his appearance before the committee, refused to state "on the grounds of the fifth amendment" whether he had ever engaged in espionage activities against the Government and the people of the United States. He likewise refused to state whether he was a member of the Communist Party the instant he had affixed his signature to the passport application in 1958, and whether he was a member of the Communist Party during his appearance before the committee. The record further reveals that in December 1958 Mr. Perlo addressed a letter to the Chief of the Passport Office, as follows:

DEAR MRS. KNIGHT: I have your letter of November 24. Since you are apparently determined to violate the law by denying me a passport, and since it is obvious from Mr. O'Connor's reference to me in his speech of November 8 that my application has been prejudged, please return my application and fee.*

Martin Popper, of New York City, appeared in response to a subpoena. He identified a photostatic copy of his application for a passport which he had obtained on August 26, 1958, in which application Mr. Popper had omitted answers to questions respecting membership in the Communist Party.

When asked whether he was a member of the Communist Party at the time he executed the application for a passport, Mr. Popper declined to answer.

Mr. Popper also identified a photostatic copy of a passport application executed by him on March 11, 1946, pursuant to which Mr. Popper received a passport to travel to Germany to observe the Nuremberg trials. He declined to state whether he was a member of the Com-

*In December 1959 Perlo sued for, and was granted, a passport.

munist Party at the time he made the application for the passport, and whether he conferred with Communist Party leaders in any foreign country during his trip abroad.

Mr. Popper further identified an application he had filed for a passport on September 26, 1946, pursuant to which he procured a passport to attend a meeting of the International Congress of Lawyers in Paris. Mr. Popper was then secretary of the National Lawyers Guild.

Mr. Popper refused to answer whether he was a member of the Communist Party at the time of his attendance at the International Congress of Lawyers in Paris. He identified a photostatic copy of an application for a passport filed by him in 1954 and, in connection therewith, a copy of a letter addressed to him from the Director of the Passport Office in which it was stated that "In your case it has been alleged that you were a Communist" and that "* * * the evidence indicates on your part a consistent and prolonged adherence to the Communist Party line * * *." The letter stated that Mr. Popper would be "required to submit a sworn statement whether you are now or ever have been a Communist."

Mr. Popper refused to state whether he was at the time of the hearing a member of the Communist Party and whether previous testimony of Mr. Mortimer Riemer before this committee was correct. Mr. Riemer had testified that Mr. Popper was a member of a Communist group composed exclusively of lawyers. He gave a number of reasons for his refusal but specifically did not claim the privilege against self-incrimination.

Mr. Popper was subsequently cited for contempt of Congress by the House of Representatives and indicted by a Federal grand jury on November 24, 1959.

Victor Michael Berman, of New York City, appeared in response to a subpoena but refused to answer any questions of the committee, except to give his name and address, and to say that he was presently unemployed. He based his refusal on the ground, among others, "of my constitutional privilege under the fifth amendment."

Mr. Berman was interrogated respecting a trip made by him to the World Youth Festival in Budapest in August 1949, his chairmanship of the Student Branch of the Communist Party at the University of Colorado in 1949, and his membership in the New York section of the Communist Party in 1954.

He persisted in his refusal to answer all questions including the question of whether he was at the time of the hearing a member of the Communist Party, basing his refusal on the ground, among others, "of my constitutional privilege under the fifth amendment." Mr. Berman had filed a passport application under date of September 8, 1958, in which he had failed to answer questions respecting membership in the Communist Party. A passport was subsequently issued to him.

Sidney T. Efross, of Silver Spring, Maryland, appeared in response to a subpoena. When asked to state his occupational background, he declined to do so on the ground, among others, that his answer would incriminate him. Mr. Efross was confronted with the testimony of Mr. Frank Peoples, of Lorain, Ohio, who testified that, while he was serving in the Communist Party as an undercover agent of the Federal

Bureau of Investigation, he knew Sidney Efross as a member of the Communist Party and the captain of a party group in the steel industry in Lorain in 1950. Mr. Efross declined to answer any questions respecting this testimony, basing his declination "on the same grounds."

Mr. Efross was shown a copy of an application for a passport filed by him on January 13, 1953, for travel to Europe, and a letter of March 25, 1953, from the Director of the Passport Office disapproving the application on security grounds. He refused to say if he was a member of the Communist Party at the time of his passport application.

Elizabeth Boynton Millard, of New York City, appeared in response to a subpoena. She declined to answer questions respecting her educational background or occupational record, basing her declination on various grounds including the "protection of the first and fifth amendments."

There was displayed to Miss Millard a copy of the Daily Worker of April 17, 1950, containing an article by Betty Millard respecting a trip she had made to Red China, but she declined "on the same grounds" to answer any questions respecting the article or the trip.

There was likewise displayed to Miss Millard a photograph clipped from an East German publication of February 4, 1951, bearing a caption identifying Betty Millard as a participant in a Communist rally in East Germany. She declined to answer any questions respecting the subject matter "on the same grounds."

Miss Millard was shown a photostatic copy of an application for a passport made by her in July 1958, bearing a stamp "passport issued November 4, 1958" in which application Miss Millard failed to answer questions respecting membership in the Communist Party. Miss Millard declined to answer when asked if she was a member of the Communist Party at the time she appeared before the committee.

John W. Hanes, Jr., Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State, accompanied by John W. Sipes, Security Counsel, Department of State, testified respecting passport security legislation. Characterizing existing passport control as a "particularly dangerous hole in our defenses against the operations of the international Communist conspiracy," Mr. Hanes stated that at the present time the Department of State has no alternative but to issue passports upon demand to hard-core, active Communist Party members and supporters.

Continuing, Mr. Hanes testified:

I don't know exactly how many members the Communist Party of the United States now has—perhaps fifteen or twenty thousand. But, however many there are, each and every party member as of today can get a passport from the Department of State, except in the rare instance that he happens to be ineligible for some other reason, such as being a fugitive from justice. This is a breach in our defenses which our enemies have been quick to take advantage of. Many persons with known Communist affiliations have applied for passports since the decision of the Supreme Court, some of them even though they have no present intention of going abroad.

Mr. Hanes discussed the history and background of passport security and recommended certain legislation to block existing loopholes. Among the significant comments by Mr. Hanes on proposed legislation was the following:

I can say bluntly that any legislation concerning denial of passports to Communist supporters would be meaningless and would not achieve any purpose if it prohibited the government from utilizing confidential information. Almost without exception, dangerous cases in the Communist area involve confidential information and investigative sources. Indeed, the more recent and meaningful our information is, the more likely it is that it has come from current confidential investigative sources within the Communist movement.

For the committee legislative recommendation on passport security see pages 129 and 130 of this report.

AMERICAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION IN MOSCOW

On June 3, 1959, the committee chairman addressed the House on the subject of the 72 paintings and works of sculpture by 69 American artists selected for the art display in the American National Exhibition which opened in Moscow on July 25, 1959.¹²

The chairman revealed in his speech that approximately one-half of these artists had records of affiliation with Communist fronts and causes and that 22, or roughly one-third of them, had significant records of this type. These 22, according to a check of committee files, had a total of at least 465 separate connections with Communist organizations or Communist-sponsored causes. One of these men, he pointed out, had been publicly identified as a Communist Party member, and the affiliations of some of the other artists were "so extensive and of such a nature that they raised serious questions as to where their loyalty actually lies."

Some of these artists, the chairman stated, had taught at Communist Party schools, written for Communist Party publications, endorsed open Communist Party members for public office, contributed art work to Communist Party magazines, and had urged participation in the party's May Day parades. He detailed the manner in which several of the artists had aided the Communist Party.

On July 1, 1959, the committee held hearings on the subject. The principal witness was Wheeler Williams, who has held many important positions in the art world and is currently president of the American Artists Professional League, the largest organization of professional artists in the United States.

Mr. Williams testified that the American Artists Professional League had been disturbed when, early in March 1959, it learned the names of the judges selected to choose the paintings and sculptures for the exhibition, and that he, as president of the league, had written to President Eisenhower to inform him the league was "gravely concerned" about this matter. Government-arranged American art exhibitions shown abroad in the past had reflected little honor on this

¹² See "The American National Exhibition, Moscow, July 1959," Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities, July 1, 1959.

country, he told the President, and urged that steps be taken to insure that any art sent to the Soviet Union would be of a high quality so that it could not be used as proof of U.S. cultural decadence.

Mr. Williams said in his appearance before the committee that the exhibition of American art sent to Moscow was a "discredit" to the United States and that it should be shipped home.

Mr. Williams described the purpose of the Communists in infiltrating the art world in the following words:

They want to destroy all phases of our culture; and if they can destroy our faith in God and our faith in the beauty and wonders of our cultural heritage, including the arts and literature and music and so forth, they can take us over without a hydrogen bomb. They can take us over with popguns.

In extensive, detailed testimony on communism in art, Mr. Williams pointed out that Communist doctrine demands "Socialist Realism" in art produced in the Soviet Union and all Communist nations. This means that art must be generally traditional or classicist in form so that it can be readily understood by all people and that it must contain a message or propaganda. The message may be positive or negative. A positive one would glorify communism and the Soviet Union in some way. A negative one, on the other hand, would depict a non-Communist or capitalist nation or persons unfavorably.

"Modernist" art forms are barred in Communist countries today, Mr. Williams said, because, being unintelligible to many people, they are not good propaganda media. He pointed out, however, that this does not mean that Communists oppose modern art everywhere and at all times. He stated that extreme practitioners of modern art forms dominated art in the Soviet Union for a number of years after the Bolshevik Revolution with the official endorsement of the Communist government. The purpose in this, Mr. Williams said, was to promote the destruction of the roots and all vestiges of pre-Communist culture, to make a complete cultural, as well as political, break with the past.

Immediately after the Bolshevik Revolution, the Communists in Russia wanted to tear down, so far as they were able and in all fields, all so-called "bourgeois" ideas—political, economic, religious, and artistic.

The so-called modern art forms were, as the authorities I have quoted point out, a revolt against the established order.

After the modern art forms had served this purpose, Mr. Williams testified, they were thrown out and "Socialist Realism" was introduced in the Soviet Union. Artists were denied the freedom to paint what they chose and, to a great extent, turned into political hacks.

Mr. Williams, in describing the Communist view of modern art forms, quoted Jack Chen, former Daily Worker correspondent, who had written:

At the point where typically bourgeois art descends step by step from the truest vision of reality that it attained, and disintegrates in the realms of fantasy, in cubism, constructivism, expressionism, and surrealism, it is there that Socialist ideology and its art bound up with the great progressive

labor movement carries human vision forward again to realism, reintegrates it, and advances to social realism, to a truer vision of the world and to greater heights of art and humanist aspiration.

Translating Chen's words into everyday English, Mr. Williams said:

In other words, from the Kremlin or Stalinist viewpoint, the modern art forms represent a decline in what Communists call "bourgeois art," which is really the classic tradition in Western art. It is here in this period of decline, in the Communist view, that they step in and weld propaganda to traditional art to make it "Socialist Realism" which, in their opinion, is a higher stage of artistic achievement than anything which existed in the past.

Mr. Williams then gave detailed testimony—with concrete examples taken from Communist Party documents—on how Communists in this country have used, and are still using, art and artists—both modern and traditional—to promote their objectives. He told how they exploit the prestige of artists through Communist fronts; how they arrange exhibitions through Communist-controlled groups which display pro-Communist art; and revealed that the party even has an art gallery of its own in New York City.

Mr. Williams concluded his testimony by expressing the hope that the American public would become alerted to the inroads Communists have made in the art field in this country.

The second witness in the hearing was Mr. Frank Wright, an artist and also a member of the board of directors of the American Artists Professional League. Mr. Wright had formerly been economic adviser to the Bipartite Control Office for Germany and, as an outgrowth of his experience with economic warfare in that position, had become interested in the subject of propaganda or psychological warfare which he characterized as "communications warfare."

In this warfare, he said, Moscow attempts to subvert free nations through words, symbols, and images. On the other hand, with the Iron Curtain as a barrier to communication, it attempts to prevent its slaves from learning what the outside world is really like, and those outside the Iron Curtain from learning what the true conditions are behind it.

Two fundamental objectives of the Communists in their communications warfare, Mr. Wright testified, were to produce "organized confusion of the mind" and corrosion of values among non-Communist peoples. Art, he said, is "a prime weapon" in this type of warfare.

Two artists whose works had been selected for the American National Exhibition in Moscow testified under subpoena in the course of the hearings.

Ben Shahn, of Roosevelt, New Jersey, invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he had ever been a member of the Communist Party; if he had ever contributed his art work to raise funds for Communist enterprises; if he knew that persons to whom he had submitted work for the Communist magazine, *New Masses*, were members of the Communist Party.

He admitted having taught at the John Reed Club School of Art, but invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he knew at the time that it was a Communist enterprise. He also invoked the fifth amend-

ment when asked if it was true that the school was an institution for the "development of young revolutionary artists"; when asked about his affiliation with various Communist fronts and about his endorsement of a statement on October 16, 1958, which called, in effect, for the United States to surrender to the Soviet Union on several vital policy matters.

Mr. Shahn was employed by the Resettlement Administration from 1935 to 1937; had painted murals for the Social Security Building in Washington in 1941, and, in 1942, worked for the Office of War Information. He denied that he had been a Communist Party member at any time while employed by the Government.

Philip Evergood, of Oxford, Connecticut, invoked the fifth amendment on nearly all questions asked him. These included whether he was presently a member of the Communist Party; whether he had ever been a member of the party; whether he was the author of several articles published in the *Daily Worker*, official Communist Party newspaper; whether he had taught in Communist Party schools; had been editor of the Communist magazine *Masses and Mainstream*; had been affiliated with numerous Communist fronts in the art and other fields; and whether he had ever "knowingly and consciously" used his art "for the purpose of furthering the objectives of the Communist Party of the United States."

Subsequent to the committee hearings, the U.S. Information Agency, at the direction of President Eisenhower, added about 25 additional paintings—covering earlier periods in American art history—to the U.S. exhibition in Moscow.

COMMUNIST TRAINING OPERATIONS

On July 21 and 22, 1959, the first in a series of hearings on Communist training operations was held in Washington, D.C.¹³ In outlining the scope of the hearings, the chairman of the committee stated:

Many people wonder what makes a dedicated Communist. How are intelligent American citizens molded into such thoroughly committed revolutionaries that they will, as Lenin said, devote "the whole of their lives" to the Communist conspiracy?

The experience of this committee compels the conclusion that this process is not accomplished overnight. A first step is often the subtle indoctrination of students by individual Communists who are employed as teachers in non-Communist educational institutions. Beyond this, the Communist conspiracy has two principal organized training operations.

The first consists of schools, forums, and courses designed to soften up and condition the students—whether they are actually members of the party or not—and to act as a screening or selection program in which likely material is chosen for development in the second type of Communist training operation, which is for hard-core, disciplined conspirators.

In these hearings which are beginning today, we will sample activities of individual Communists engaged in teaching

¹³ "Communist Training Operations." Part 1, Hearings before Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21 and 22, 1959.

in non-Communist institutions, as well as each of the two types of organized Communist training operations.

The Jefferson School of Social Science, through the years, was of the first type of Communist training operation, where there were taught to Communists and non-Communists alike courses which were designed to soften up and condition the students and to develop prospective material for training as hard-core Communists.

In proceedings under the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Subversive Activities Control Board on June 30, 1953, found the Jefferson School of Social Science to be a Communist-front organization and that it, therefore, should register under the provisions of the Act.

Shortly, thereafter, the Communist operation devised what looked like a very simple evasive tactic, namely, to dissolve the Jefferson School of Social Science, which they did; but it was not long before there was created with substantially the same faculty and courses a new school known as the Faculty of Social Science.

We expect in these hearings to explore this Faculty of Social Science to determine if our present investigative leads appear to be correct, namely, that for all intents and purposes the Faculty of Social Science is merely a successor to the Jefferson School of Social Science.

Now, with reference to the second type of Communist operation, namely, the training program of the hard-core cadre, in May of this year James E. Jackson, Jr., who is one of the top Communist conspirators operating in the United States, returned here from Moscow, to which he had traveled on a United States passport which was issued to him shortly after the Supreme Court struck down the power of the Secretary of State to deny passports to Communists.

Jackson's orders from the Kremlin, which have now been transmitted to the comrades in the United States, are to intensify the training of key revolutionaries in sabotage, subversion, and penetration.

We have under subpoena the educational director of the Communist Party, Hyman Lumer, who, we have learned from our field investigations, is now supervising the secret training programs in key centers of the Nation in which select comrades are given specialized training in conspiratorial strategies and tactics.

At the outset of the hearings, a number of exhibits were inserted into the record demonstrating the similarities between the Communist front, the Jefferson School of Social Science, and the Faculty of Social Science. The exhibits, chiefly from Communist sources, also revealed that Communist training operations were temporarily continued through the media of so-called "Marxist Forums" after the dissolution of the Jefferson School in 1956. Initiated in New York in 1957, these forums were held weekly and utilized speakers previously on the faculty of the Jefferson School. When the Faculty of Social Science opened in New York City in September 1958, organized Marxist study courses were concentrated there.

Frank S. Meyer, Woodstock, N.Y., was a member of the Communist Party from 1931 until 1945. Since he broke with the party in 1945, Mr. Meyer has rendered valuable service to the Government in revealing the true nature and inner workings of the Communist apparatus. His background in Communist educational and organizational work is extensive. In the early 1930's he was secretary of the Student Bureau of the British Communist Party and a member of its Central Committee. In 1934 he was transferred to the Communist Party of the United States; was educational director of its Chicago South Side Section Committee from 1935 to 1937; education director of the party's Illinois-Indiana district and director of the Chicago Workers School, which functioned in conjunction with the party's educational commission, from 1938 to 1941; and district membership director and organizational secretary in Illinois from 1941 to 1942. Mr. Meyer served at various times as chairman and secretary of the educational commissions of the Communist Party's national conventions and taught at the Jefferson School of Social Science from 1944 to 1945.

In testimony before the committee on July 21, Mr. Meyer identified many individuals on the staff of the Faculty of Social Science as persons he had known as Communist Party members and instructors at the Jefferson School. He testified that the courses of instruction at the Faculty of Social Science, as displayed in committee exhibits, follow the same pattern as the courses taught in past years at such Communist Party schools as the Workers School and the Jefferson School.

Appraising the brochures and teaching staff at the Faculty of Social Science, Mr. Meyer declared:

* * * It looks exactly like similar Communist operations have always looked, and seems to be a lineal descendant of a long line of ancestors, all Communist operated and controlled.

Mr. Meyer also provided the committee with a broad picture of Communist training operations which he said could be divided into three phases; namely, public agitation and propaganda, the molding of hard-core Communists, and inner party training schools—"for the purpose of putting a final hardness, understanding from the party's point of view, toughness, on the Communist who is already approaching top leadership positions."

Mr. Meyer explained:

Of the three I mentioned, examples would be first, in the category of the drawing of people toward the party. I think any issue of the Daily Worker that you open you will find advertised forums, clubs, lectures, places which are current and popular issues of one sort or another, which will bring people who might be interested in that issue forward.

Also, a Communist Party member will hold in his home a class or discussion group, which gets a number of neighbors or friends he has met, or people he has worked with in activities of various kinds. Also, such schools as the Jefferson School itself have as one part of their activity a whole group of courses devoted toward bringing in peripherally interested people. That is the first type.

The second type, the beginning of the training of Communists, new Communists, is conducted in a number of ways. First, every Communist Party meeting has an educational section, a portion of its agenda devoted to educational discussion. Then, a widespread series of classes is held within the party in a section or a district for newer party members. Thirdly, in schools of the Jefferson School type, one of the functions of those schools is to conduct classes that can be utilized for this purpose, for the first stage of training of the party members.

The third type of training consists of a network of schools, full-time party schools, from the local level—section schools—through district schools, to national schools, and finally to the international schools that have been run over the years under various names by the international Communist movement.

The Communist Party of the United States, Mr. Meyer warned, “is strong, lithe, and determined.” Its education is not merely a matter of spreading to the members and people a set of principles. Its major purpose, he declared is “to mold, train, transform the whole man.”

He expressed the opinion that the success of the Communist movement throughout the world was due largely to our apparent loss of faith in the ancient Western heritage and to the teaching in our schools and society of a relativism which eats away the great traditions of the West and of American freedom. Mr. Meyer declared that the Communists, in contrast, are determined, deeply convinced, and fired with a zeal which we have not been able to match.

Harold Collins, of Brooklyn, N.Y., secretary of the Faculty of Social Science, was then questioned extensively by the committee.

Mr. Collins was identified by Mr. Meyer as a member of the Communist Party. A veteran Marxist educator, Mr. Collins has worked in party training schools since at least 1944, when he was secretary of the Jefferson School of Social Science. In addition to his duties as secretary and instructor at the Jefferson School, Mr. Meyer testified, Mr. Collins was chairman of the committee for the Marxist-Leninist Institute, an inner-core school within Jefferson, whose purpose it was to develop Communist Party functionaries. In 1948 he was in charge of the school's public relations.

Harold Collins was one of the group of former Jefferson School of Social Science instructors who comprised the original staff of the Faculty of Social Science when that organization was established in September 1958.

Prior to the opening of the Winter 1959 semester, the Daily Worker published an article “Education Roundup” written by Harold Collins, in which he claimed that several hundred people “attended the classes given at Adelphi Hall during the last school year by members of what has now become The Faculty [of Social Science].” Declaring that it is “essential that we all keep our eyes on the educational achievements of the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China,” Mr. Collins asserted that “not one of us can afford to do without the kind of education that the Faculty of Social Science is now offering.”

In addition to his work in adult education courses, Mr. Collins is one of the instructors in the "new program of classes" designed especially for youth by the Faculty of Social Science.

In his appearance before the committee, Mr. Collins refused to answer questions regarding his connection with the Faculty of Social Science; his Communist Party membership; or his past Communist Party activities, basing his refusal on the ground that his answers might incriminate him.

The committee was unable to serve a subpoena upon Dr. Herbert Aptheker, director of the Faculty of Social Science, because he was traveling in Europe.

Dr. Aptheker, however, is an admitted Communist. In 1949, and again in 1954, when he appeared as a witness for the defense of the Communist leaders being tried for Smith Act violations, Dr. Aptheker admitted that he had been an active member of the Communist Party since he joined it in 1939.

According to his past testimony, Dr. Aptheker has been teaching at schools conducted by the Communist Party since 1940, when he was an instructor at the School for Democracy. This school was established by Communist teachers ousted from the public school system in New York City.

At the Jefferson School of Social Science, established in 1944 through a merger of the old Communist Party Workers School and the School for Democracy, Dr. Aptheker was a member of the faculty from approximately 1945 until the school closed in December 1956. In the early 1950's he was made a member of its board of trustees, a position he retained for the duration of the school's existence.

Concurrently with his work at Jefferson, Herbert Aptheker was a functionary in the Communist Party and managing editor of Political Affairs, a monthly publication which calls itself a "Theoretical and Political Magazine of Scientific Socialism," but is in reality the Communist Party's theoretical organ.

The reestablishment of organized Marxist study was announced in September 1958. The new training school, established under the name "Faculty of Social Science" was headed by Dr. Herbert Aptheker. In addition to serving as director of the school, Dr. Aptheker, together with Harold Collins, heads its teaching staff and conducts courses in several subjects, including "Marxist Theory Today" which is described as the study of "relations among Socialist nations; paths to socialism."

The committee interrogated other witnesses who serve as instructors at the Faculty of Social Science. They uniformly invoked the fifth amendment in response to committee questioning.

Myer Weise, of Flushing, N.Y., an instructor who appeared in response to a subpoena but refused to reply to questions, has been teaching in Communist training schools since at least 1937 and, according to the Communist press, is an authority on Marxism-Leninism. Mr. Weise emigrated from the Ukraine to the United States in 1929 and became a naturalized citizen in 1937. The same year he was granted citizenship. Mr. Weise was an instructor at the Communist Workers School. According to the school catalog, his subject, "Marxism-Leninism II," would "give the student an understanding of the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution, hammered out and tested in

the years of struggle throughout the world * * * . The course will include * * * the application of these basic Leninist principles to the strategic and tactical question facing the revolutionary movement today."

Mr. Weise was also an instructor at the Jefferson School of Social Science. He has been a member of the teaching staff of the Faculty of Social Science since the school's inception.

Irving Potash, who also invoked the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination and refused to answer all committee questions pertaining to Communist Party membership and activities, joined the staff of the Faculty of Social Science in the spring of 1959, according to announcements in the Communist press.

Mr. Potash was one of the eleven top Communist leaders convicted in 1949 of conspiracy to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government.

After serving 3 years and 5 months of his sentence, Potash was released from prison. He was immediately rearrested on an untied second count of the Smith Act, making it illegal to knowingly belong to a party which advocates violent overthrow of the Government.

Rather than face another 5 years in prison, if convicted, Potash, who came to this country in 1913, agreed to voluntary deportation to Poland and sailed for Europe in 1955.

According to the Daily Worker, August 23, 1956, Potash was touring Communist China as an observer and correspondent. The Worker noted that, on the completion of his trip in late September, Potash would write a series of articles on his observations in Red China.

In January 1957, the Federal Bureau of Investigation arrested Potash in New York on charges of illegal re-entry. He was given a 2-year prison sentence and released in August 1958. According to the Daily Worker, Potash has been denied readmission to Poland and is currently under supervisory parole. There is outstanding against him a permanent order for deportation.

Another instructor at the Faculty of Social Science who invoked the fifth amendment in response to committee questions was Hyman Lumer, who is also educational director for the Communist Party.

The committee ascertained from its field investigations that immediately prior to his appearance before the committee, Lumer was supervising secret training programs in key centers of the Nation, in which selected comrades receive specialized training in conspiratorial strategies and tactics.

Leon Josephson, a teacher at the Faculty of Social Science, who has publicly proclaimed his allegiance to the Communist movement, invoked the privilege against self-incrimination and refused to answer all questions pertaining to Communist Party membership or activities when he appeared before the committee in the course of these hearings. His efforts in behalf of the Communist conspiracy date back to the 1920's. According to the testimony of former Communist Fred Beal, Josephson served as an agent for Soviet Russia in that period. He was an instructor at the Jefferson School of Social Science and joined the teaching staff of the Faculty of Social Science as soon as the latter was formed. He has publicly declared: "If I attempted to undermine or overthrow the Soviet State, I would deserve the

merited fate of all enemies of the people." He is teaching "Soviet Democracy" and "Background: From the 20th to the 21st Soviet Party Congress" at the Faculty of Social Science.

Henry Klein, an identified Communist, instructs youth classes at the Faculty of Social Science. Although Mr. Klein refused to answer pertinent committee questions, the committee introduced exhibits demonstrating that his work in Communist training operations dates back to at least 1941. In that year he was appointed educational director for New York City by the International Workers Order, cited as "one of the most effective" Communist-front organizations. Mr. Klein was an instructor at the Jefferson School of Social Science and taught at the Marxist Forums in 1957 and 1958. In October 1958, the Faculty of Social Science launched a new program of classes designed especially for youth and announced that Henry Klein would be one of the instructors. He has continued at the Faculty of Social Science through 1959, teaching such subjects as "Marxist Theory of the State."

Esther Cantor, another instructor at the Faculty of Social Science, has been a publicly known Communist Party leader in New York State since at least 1940, when she was organizational secretary of the Industrial Section of the party. She has also served as Manhattan legislative director; as a member of the New York County Committee; New York State legislative director, and at the time of the hearing was a member of the New York State Committee of the Communist Party. When she appeared as a witness before the committee, Mrs. Cantor refused to answer questions pertaining to her Communist Party membership or activities on the ground that her answers might incriminate her.

Another witness, Sidney Finkelstein, has been connected with Communist training schools since at least 1947. He was an instructor and lecturer at the Jefferson School of Social Science from that date until the school closed in 1956. In addition to his work at the Jefferson School, Mr. Finkelstein was a member of the board of directors of the Communist-controlled Metropolitan Music School in 1955 and 1956. Mr. Finkelstein was an instructor at the Marxist Forums in 1957 and 1958, and he has been teaching at the Faculty of Social Science ever since the school was opened. He invoked the privilege against self-incrimination when interrogated by the committee respecting the Faculty of Social Science and his connections with the Communist Party.

Susan Warren's membership in the Communist Party is a matter of public record. In addition to the publicity given by the Daily Worker to her work for the party, the 1948 catalog for the Jefferson School of Social Science records that Miss Warren, one of the teachers at the school, was a former "Educational Director, N.Y. County Committee, Communist Party." As an instructor at the Jefferson School in the late 1940's and early 1950's, Miss Warren taught such subjects as "Capitalism and the Class Struggle," and "The New China." In 1955 and 1956 her subjects included "China, India and Africa: New Role in World Politics." At the Marxist Forums held in Adelphi Hall in early 1958, China was again the subject of her lecture. In December of that year Miss Warren was scheduled to teach "On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People" at the Faculty of Social Science. As a member of the teaching staff of the Faculty in

1959, Sue Warren, The Worker noted, would teach "The Chinese Communes." When questioned by the committee, however, Miss Warren refused to answer on the ground that her answers might incriminate her.

Louis Weinstock, another instructor at the Faculty of Social Science, who refused to respond to committee questioning, was one of the national Communist Party leaders convicted in 1953 of wilfully and knowingly conspiring to teach and advocate the overthrow and destruction of the Government by force and violence. He has been teaching in Communist training schools since the early 1940's, when he was an instructor at the New York Workers School. He taught at the Jefferson School and in 1957 lectured at the Marxist Forums. He is currently an instructor on labor problems at the Faculty of Social Science.

During the hearings on Communist training operations, the committee also heard testimony from Richard Wilson Reichard, of Arlington, Va. He was summoned in connection with the committee's concern over the indoctrination of students by individual Communists who are employed as teachers in non-Communist educational institutions. Mr. Reichard was confronted with committee information that he had been a member of the Young Communist League while a student at Harvard University; that from 1946 through 1949, he had been a leader of the student unit of the Communist Party at Harvard University; that he had been branch organizer for the Second Harvard College Undergraduate Branch of the Communist Party from 1948 to 1949; and that he was later transferred from the Communist operation in Harvard to the Communist Party in Palo Alto, California.

The witness was reminded of his privilege of counsel, but he stated he had contacted counsel but chose to proceed without legal representation. Invoking the privilege against self-incrimination, Mr. Reichard refused to answer questions pertaining to the information in the possession of the committee or to say whether he is currently a member of the Communist Party.

The committee believes that the evidence presented as a result of these hearings clearly establishes that the Faculty of Social Science is, for all intents and purposes, a successor to the Jefferson School of Social Science and that, like the Jefferson School of Social Science, it is an adjunct of the Communist Party for the purpose of indoctrinating Communists and Communist sympathizers in the theory and practice of communism and in promoting Communist objectives.

It is apparent that the Jefferson School of Social Science was dissolved and the successor organization created principally for the purpose of evading provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950. The Jefferson School disbanded only after the Subversive Activities Control Board, proceeding under the Act, had issued an order to the Jefferson School to register as a Communist-front organization.

In view of the evasive tactics which have been adopted by Communist-front organizations to avoid compliance with existing legislation, the committee is recommending certain amendments to the Internal Security Act of 1950 (see p. 134).

TESTIMONY OF CLINTON EDWARD JENCKS

Clinton Edward Jencks appeared as a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities on July 22, 1959, in response to a subpoena.¹⁴ The witness testified that he was born in 1918; was a resident of Albany, California; and was employed as a machinist. He further stated that he was educated in the public school system of Colorado Springs and was awarded a bachelor of arts degree in 1939 by the University of Colorado.

Subsequently, Mr. Jencks stated, he held various jobs and served in the Armed Forces during World War II. Following his release in 1945, his work in a plant in Denver brought him into the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers.¹⁵ In 1947 he was made business representative for a group of IUMMSW unions in southwestern New Mexico. In 1950 he was appointed international representative for District 2 (IUMMSW), comprising the southwestern area of the country, a post he held until he resigned in 1956.

Mr. Jencks was identified as a member of the Communist Party by Kenneth Eckert during the latter's testimony before another congressional committee in October 1952. When the Committee on Un-American Activities asked Mr. Jencks whether Mr. Eckert had been in error in identifying him as a Communist, he refused to answer on the ground that his answer might tend to incriminate him. He denied present membership in the Communist Party, but refused to state whether he ever had been a member. He also invoked the privilege of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination in refusing to state whether he had any information respecting Communists or Communist activities during the period he served as international representative of the IUMMSW.

Mr. Jencks related that in the fall of 1958 he applied to the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation of Princeton, New Jersey, for a graduate fellowship for study at the University of California. The fellowship was subsequently awarded to him. According to his testimony, however, at no time did he reveal to representatives of the Foundation whether he had ever been a member of the Communist Party. In his application for the fellowship, Mr. Jencks included the following statement:

After serving as president of the amalgamated local unions for five years I found myself charged with having falsely signed the Taft-Hartley non-Communist affidavit, and in 1954 in El Paso, Tex., I was convicted. This came in an atmosphere of great press hysteria following a long and bitter strike against a major mining company. In June, 1957, I won vindication and reversal of the conviction from the United States Supreme Court, with the Department of Justice subsequently asking dismissal of the case.

The following testimony in connection with his statement is significant and revealing:

Mr. ARENS. Did you mean to convey the impression to the people who were passing upon your application for this fel-

¹⁴ See "Testimony of Clinton Edward Jencks," Hearing before Committee on Un-American Activities, July 22, 1959.

¹⁵ The CIO expelled the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers as a Communist-dominated union in 1950.

lowship that you had not falsely signed the non-Communist affidavit?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. JENCKS. I understand. You mean did I give him the impression that I had not falsely signed the affidavit?

Mr. ARENS. That is right, sir; that is the question.

Mr. JENCKS. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. That is the impression you meant to convey?

Mr. JENCKS. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Was that a truthful impression?

In other words, were you telling the truth when you conveyed the impression by this application that you had not falsely signed a non-Communist affidavit?

Mr. JENCKS. Well, I would dearly love to answer that question if it did not mean that I would have to fear opening up this whole thing, but under the circumstances——

Mr. ARENS. All we are asking you to do, Mr. Jencks, is to tell the truth now.

Did you tell the truth when you conveyed the impression—you said you conveyed the impression—did you tell the truth to these professors when you conveyed the impression to them that you had not signed the non-Communist affidavit falsely?

Mr. JENCKS. I certainly told the professors the truth. There is no question about that.

With regard to that, the other part of the question, where you try to drag this whole case in by the tail, I refuse to answer it.

Mr. ARENS. We are not trying to drag the whole case in by the tail.

Mr. JENCKS. I beg your pardon; you are.

Mr. ARENS. We are trying to get the facts and the truth.

Mr. JENCKS. No, you are not.

Mr. ARENS. You told us a moment ago, did you not, sir, that you meant to convey the impression to these professors that you had not falsely signed the non-Communist affidavit? Is that not the impression you meant to convey?

Mr. JENCKS. Yes.

Mr. ARENS. Was that the truth?

Mr. JENCKS. Well, there, again, you are enough of an attorney to understand that I must object and refuse to answer that question on the grounds previously stated, all of the grounds.

Mr. ARENS. In other words, if you now told this Committee on Un-American Activities whether or not you had told the truth when you filed this application with the professors, you would be supplying information which might be used against you in a criminal proceeding; is that correct?

(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

Mr. JENCKS. Yes, in addition to waiving what I conceive to be the statute of limitations to open up this whole deal to exploration, litigation again; yes, sir.

ARNOLD JOHNSON, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

Prior to Nikita Khrushchev's visit to this country in September of this year, the Committee on Un-American Activities learned that one Arnold Johnson, legislative director of the Communist Party, U.S.A., had made a secret cross-country trip to several key cities which were expected to be included in Khrushchev's itinerary. The tour, which began immediately following the announcement of the impending visit by the Kremlin leader, was made for the purpose of collecting derogatory information on unemployment, racial troubles, juvenile delinquency, and labor troubles to provide Khrushchev with anti-U.S. propaganda ammunition. In order to contact the proper agencies and secure the desired information in such cities as New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, Mr. Johnson posed as a free-lance writer on a special assignment. His copious notes were thereupon forwarded to Russia.

In the course of its investigation into this activity on the part of the Communist Party, the committee subpoenaed Mr. Johnson to appear before it on September 22, 1959, in executive session. This testimony was later released to the public.¹⁶

When the committee questioned Mr. Johnson concerning his tour, as well as other activities in which he has recently been engaged, he refused to furnish anything but his name and address. Mr. Johnson not only invoked the privilege of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination, but challenged the constitutionality of the committee. As in the case of many other Communists subpoenaed before the committee, Mr. Johnson echoed the Communist Party line in such statements as:

In the first place, it seems to me that your very statement of the themes which you are pursuing only confirm in my mind my view that the whole role of this committee violates the fundamentals of the Constitution and of the Bill of Rights.

I have no intention at any time of cooperating or aiding any committee where I think that committee, in the performance of its work, is actually destroying the Bill of Rights * * *.

Although publicly known as the national legislative director of the Communist Party, U.S.A., Mr. Johnson refused to confirm the fact when asked to state his occupation. The record shows that as recently as May 15, 1959, Arnold Johnson testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, during which he stated that he was a member of the Communist Party and its national legislative director.

One of the techniques utilized by the Communist Party in promoting its line is the medium of lobbying activities. The party seeks through individuals, as well as through pressure groups, to influence Members of the Congress in their consideration of certain bills in which the party is particularly interested. It was called to the attention of the committee that Arnold Johnson, as national legislative director of the CPUSA, had engaged in direct lobbying activity despite the fact that neither he nor the Communist Party had registered under the Lobby-

¹⁶ See "Testimony of Arnold Johnson, Legislative Director of the Communist Party, U.S.A.," Hearing before Committee on Un-American Activities, September 22, 1959.

ing Act. Confronted with this fact, Mr. Johnson again invoked the privilege of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination.

During the month of July, the committee held investigations and hearings on training operations conducted by the Communist Party primarily at a center called the Faculty of Social Science in New York City. It was found that it operated for the purpose of indoctrinating Communists and Communist sympathizers in the theory and practice of communism and in promoting Communist objectives. At that time, Arnold Johnson was identified as a member of the teaching staff of the school. When interrogated respecting his connection and activities with the Faculty of Social Science, Johnson stated, "you are just way off base when you start intimidating the field of education." Committee records indicate that he not only was on the teaching staff of the Faculty, but had been an instructor at its predecessor school, the Jefferson School of Social Science.

Arnold Johnson has been a dedicated member of the Communist Party since 1936. A member of the National Committee of the Communist Party since 1942, he was elected national legislative director of the party in 1947. While serving as temporary chairman in western Pennsylvania in 1951, he was indicted with other party leaders on Smith Act charges. Sentenced to a 3-year prison term in 1953, he was released from prison in May 1957, and subsequently resumed his post as national legislative director of the Communist Party. During the years 1940 to 1947 he was district organizer in Ohio and also served as state secretary and as chairman of the state Communist Party organization. Mr. Johnson has also been a prolific contributor to such Communist publications as *The Worker*, *Political Affairs*, *New Masses*, and *The Communist*.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES AMONG PUERTO RICANS

A \$100 million Communist propaganda campaign to penetrate the Spanish-speaking countries of the Western Hemisphere, with Puerto Rico as a "nerve center," was revealed in hearings in New York City and San Juan, Puerto Rico, concerning Communist activities among Puerto Rican nationality groups.¹⁷

Minutes of a Communist hierarchy meeting in Moscow earlier this year seized by customs officials in Puerto Rico from an international courier for the Communists further revealed the establishment of a new Communist-front organization—The Soviet Association of Friendship and Cultural Cooperation With the Countries of Latin America—designed to facilitate the Communist campaign in Latin America.

In New York City, Sergei Buteneff, a supervisor in the New York office of the United States Customs Service, displayed to the subcommittee numerous Communist propaganda publications in Spanish which are being sent to Puerto Rican groups in New York City. Donald F. Barnes, a senior interpreter of the United States Department of State, translated and analyzed a number of the articles contained in the publications displayed by Mr. Buteneff—revealing the violent anti-United States nature of the propaganda.

Detective Mildred Blauvelt, of the Bureau of Special Services of the New York City Police Department, for 8 years an undercover

¹⁷ These hearings will be printed in 1960.

agent in the Communist Party, identified 13 persons known by her to have been active in the Communist Party and in Communist penetration of Puerto Rican groups in New York City.

Detective Blauvelt described the purpose of Communist interest in Puerto Rican nationality groups as follows:

It is a party tactic to foster resentment on the part of any minority group for the purpose of causing further dissension among the people in this country. In many cases, where no resentment exists, the party will strive to create it. For example, a routine arrest of some lawbreaker will be labeled persecution, police brutality, violation of civil rights, and it will be seized upon by the party as an excuse to initiate an intensive petition or leaflet campaign or to initiate the formation of a peoples civil rights or defense committee.

Jesus Colon, who had been identified by Detective Blauvelt as a member of the Communist Party active in Puerto Rican work, testified that he was a writer for *The Worker*. He refused to answer all questions regarding his writings and other activities on the ground that his answers might tend to incriminate him.

Three other witnesses appeared before the subcommittee in response to subpoenas and invoked the fifth amendment against possible self-incrimination in refusing to answer questions regarding their Communist Party membership and operations of the Communist conspiracy among Puerto Rican nationality groups. They were:

William Norman, also known as Wee Willie Marron, whose real name is William Norman Marron. Norman has held many important posts in the Communist Party, including that of membership on its National Review (disciplinary) Commission. Indicted with other party leaders under the Smith Act in June 1951, Norman went into hiding for over 4 years and then surrendered himself in December 1955. Convicted under the Smith Act and sentenced to 5 years in prison in July 1956, he was freed on appeal in August 1958, on the basis of the Supreme Court ruling in the Yates case. Before becoming a fugitive from justice, Norman had served in 1951 as one of two delegates from the U.S. Communist Party to the Third National Assembly of the Puerto Rican Communist Party;

Stanley L. Weiss, who, according to information of the committee, was a Communist contact agent between party Puerto Rican groups in New York City and Puerto Rico; and

Michael Crenovich, who taught a course entitled "The United States and Latin America," at the Communist Party's Faculty of Social Science in New York City in 1959.

Also subpoenaed to testify in the hearings were William Lorenzo Patterson and Richard Levins.

Patterson, a frequently identified Communist Party member and leader, had made two trips to Puerto Rico in November 1956 to confer with Puerto Rican party leaders as a representative of the U.S. Communist Party. Patterson refused to answer questions, alleging a lack of jurisdiction of the subcommittee.

Levins, according to committee information, moved from New York to Puerto Rico in 1951 and, at the time, transferred his membership from the U.S. to the Puerto Rican Communist Party. After being

active in the party in Puerto Rico, he returned to New York City in late 1956. He refused to testify at the hearing because a quorum of the subcommittee was not present.

NEW COMMUNIST SPLINTER GROUP

On November 16, the opening date of the Puerto Rican hearings in New York, the committee faced for the first time in public session several leaders of a new Communist splinter group, the Provisional Organizing Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Communist Party, also known as the POC.

Previous committee investigation reveals that this group was formed in August 1958 by a number of Communist Party members who were dissatisfied with the trends and policies of the party and, while within it, had referred to themselves as the Marxist-Leninist Caucus.

On the weekend of August 16-17, 1958, 83 national delegates assembled in New York City for a "Communist Conference" called by the leaders of these dissidents. Their official newspaper, *Vanguard*, reported as follows on the major developments at this meeting:

The Conference was opened by Harry Haywood, internationally known authority on the Negro question. * * *

The main political report was delivered by Armando Roman, party veteran, leader of the Puerto Rican Section, and a member of the New York State Committee [of the Communist Party]. * * *

* * * The report, entitled "Immediate Organizational Tasks of the Marxist-Leninist caucus in the CPUSA", was delivered by A. Marino [real name Angel Rene Torres], Waterfront Section organizer and member of the N.Y. State Committee [of the Communist Party]. It dealt with the latest developments in the Party crisis, traced the history of the Marxist-Leninist Caucus, and called for the formation of a Provisional Organizing Committee for the Reconstitution of a Marxist-Leninist Party. The report summed up the purpose of the Conference in a nutshell when it said: "Our expulsion from the CPUSA places on us an inescapable duty. That is to find the way to carry on the fight for a real Marxist-Leninist party under any and all conditions."¹⁸

The leaders and participants in the Provisional Organizing Committee group had been expelled from the Communist Party on the technical charge of "disruptive, factional, anti-party activities."¹⁹

The POC group is composed largely of extreme left-wing elements from the Communist Party. Throughout the party's history, there have been contending right- and left-wing factions which, in periods of turmoil such as the party has gone through in the recent past, have fought for control. The POC elements lost out in this recent struggle within the U.S. party—just as the soft, "right-wing" group led by John Gates did. When they refused to knuckle under completely to the controlling group, they were expelled.

Only time will tell with certainty the future role the group will play in the U.S. Communist movement. Though there is no sign of one

¹⁸ *Vanguard*, September 1958, pp. 1, 3.

¹⁹ *The Worker*, Sunday, October 12, 1958, p. 15.

now, a rapprochement between the POC and the party may take place, leading to the dissolution of the POC and the formal return of its members to the Communist Party itself. On the other hand, they may continue for years as a splinter group, formally divorced from the party.

The one fact that is completely clear today is that the POC group is made up of hard-core, dedicated, and extremist Communists who, despite their present differences with the Communist Party leadership, are intent upon doing all within their power to speed the achievement of the goals of international communism.

Members of the Provisional Organizing Committee who appeared before the subcommittee in New York in response to subpoenas and invoked the fifth amendment in refusing to answer questions were:

Felix Ojeda Ruiz, former editor of the *Pueblo*, official newspaper of the Puerto Rican Communist Party, published in San Juan;

Jorge W. Maysonet-Hernandez, former secretary of labor of the Municipal Committee of the Communist Party in San Juan, Puerto Rico;

Victor Agosto, who, according to information of the committee, was active at the Sixteenth (February 1957) National Convention of the U.S. Communist Party;

Angel René Torres, also known as A. Marino, editor of the *Vanguard*;

Armando Roman, identified in the party press as a former Puerto Rican Communist Party leader in New York City; and

José Santiago, who has taught at the Communist Party's Jefferson School of Social Science.

Another witness, Ramon Acevedo, did not invoke constitutional privileges, but evaded giving direct answers to questions asked him by the subcommittee. Acevedo has made trips to Puerto Rico to visit party members and has, in turn, been visited at his New York home by Puerto Rican Communist Party leaders.

PUERTO RICO

In San Juan, Puerto Rico, Irving Fishman, deputy collector of customs at the Port of New York, revealed in his testimony the details of the \$100 million Communist campaign to penetrate the Spanish-speaking countries of the Western Hemisphere. Mr. Fishman stated that the Soviet propaganda apparatus is directing a concentrated attempt to subvert South American governments and secure Communist victories in these areas. The main theme of the material issued is anti-United States. This stepped-up drive is reported to involve a cost of over \$100 million.

Mr. Fishman further characterized Puerto Rico as "a nerve center for the transshipment or dissemination of Communist propaganda in the Spanish language to South American countries."

Communist plans to facilitate this current propaganda campaign were revealed to the subcommittee in documents seized by Puerto Rican customs officials from an international courier for the Communists, Jose Enamorado Cuesta. One of the documents was the minutes of a 1959 Moscow meeting, at which was established a new international Communist-front organization designed to penetrate Latin America—The Soviet Association of Friendship and Cultural Cooper-

ation With the Countries of Latin America. The minutes of the meeting showed that the president and 15 of the vice-presidents of the newly formed front organization were residents of Iron Curtain countries.

The second document was Cuesta's personal diary, in which he discussed in detail his contacts and operations for the Communist Party during 1959. It revealed that he visited Moscow in May of that year. As he described it, "It seems like a dream. * * * I will be the first Puerto Rican ever sent on any mission."

Detective Mildred Blauvelt, testifying in Puerto Rico—again on the basis of her experiences while acting as an undercover agent in the Communist Party—explained the function and objectives and the pattern of operation which could be expected to be followed by the new Latin American Communist-front organization. She warned that The Soviet Association of Friendship and Cultural Cooperation With the Countries of Latin America "is meant to be a party front propaganda organization dominated by Moscow and is meant to be a link between the party and the people of Latin America."

In discussing its pattern of operation, she added:

For instance, such an organization would have to be broad enough in scope to appeal to the masses, to meet with any degree of success, and the party apparatus would be put into motion to achieve that success. National organizations would have to be established in each country to be involved, and branches would have to be established in various sections of these countries, particularly in large cities.

Individuals other than party members would be invited to head this organization at its various levels for the purpose of giving this organization the aura of legitimacy and respectability, and well-meaning individuals who are well known to the public at large would be solicited to lend their endorsement, their support and sponsorship, to such an organization to add to the prestige of the organization.

However, in all of this, the party would see that its party members who are well versed in party organizational work would be placed in the executive positions in this organization, so that the organization would have the proper guidance to follow the party line and thus guarantee that party policies were being carried out within the organization and that its activities reflected party propaganda.

Thirteen witnesses appeared before the subcommittee in response to subpoenas and refused to answer all questions regarding their Communist Party membership and operations of the Communist conspiracy in Puerto Rico on the ground that the subcommittee lacked jurisdiction to conduct hearings on the island of Puerto Rico. Among these were:

Jose Enamorado Cuesta, identified in his own diary as an agent of the international Communist conspiracy, who publicly joined the Communist Party in San Juan in October, 1959;

Manuel Arroyo Zeppenfeldt, who, according to information of the subcommittee, was the printer of the official Puerto Rican Communist Party publication, Pueblo;

Juan Saez Corales, the possessor of a Post Office box in San Juan through which Communist publications and directives enter Puerto Rico;

Juan Emmanuelli Morales, who, just 6 days prior to his testimony during an informal session in the offices of the committee in Washington, D.C., had volunteered information to the subcommittee staff regarding his prior Communist Party membership and the names of other members known to him;

Gertrudis Melendez Perez, one of the persons identified by Emmanuelli in his conversation with committee staff members in Washington, D.C.;

Consuelo Burgos De Pagan, identified in Communist publications as the educational director of the Puerto Rican Communist Party;

Pablo M. Garcia Rodriguez, identified in the Communist Daily Worker as a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Puerto Rico;

Cesar Andreu Iglesias, former chairman of the Puerto Rican Communist Party convicted on Smith Act charges, but later released as a result of the Yates decision of the Supreme Court;

Ramon Diaz Cruz, identified in an article in the Pueblo as the director of a publication entitled "La Paz";

John Peter Hawes, now a Puerto Rican resident, identified in prior committee hearings as a member of the Communist Party of Boston, Mass., by F.B.I. undercover agent Herbert Philbrick;

Frank Ruiz (Eusebio Ruiz Martinez) who, according to information of the subcommittee, had been a member of the Communist Party of Puerto Rico;

Juan Santos Rivera, identified in Communist publications as a one-time delegate from Puerto Rico to the Communist International in the Soviet Union and further identified as the current president of the Central Committee of the Puerto Rican Communist Party; and

Cristino Perez Mendez, who, according to information of the subcommittee, was president of the Municipal Committee of the Communist Party of Puerto Rico in 1956.

Diego L. Martin, a deputy United States marshal in Puerto Rico, testified that there were transmitted to him by the committee a number of subpoenas commanding the appearance of Eugenio Arbona Cuevas, Ramon Mirabal Carrion, and Juan A. Corretjer in the instant hearings. Arbona and Mirabal have held leadership positions in the Puerto Rican Communist Party. Although Corretjer was expelled from the party in Puerto Rico in 1948, party leaders have since met in his home.

Deputy Marshal Martin added that, from confidential sources of information, he learned that Juan Antonio Corretjer had gone first to Venezuela and later to Cuba and that Eugenio Arbona Cuevas and Ramon Mirabal Carrion had also gone to Cuba.

CHAPTER III

REPORTS

LEGAL SUBVERSION

On February 16, 1959, the committee issued a 75-page report¹ on the activities of Communists admitted to the practice of law. The committee expressed the view that these Communist lawyers posed a serious problem demanding immediate consideration, not only by the overwhelming majority of patriotic lawyers in our country, but by the Congress and the citizenry at large.

The committee declared that the activities engaged in by certain members of the conspiratorial Communist operation who have been masquerading as respected members of the legal profession clearly demonstrate that Communists seek to pervert our democratic processes, not only by their campaign of political subversion,² but by a parallel operation which may be designated as "legal subversion." This operation involves subversion by Communists trained in the law.

The report pointed out that:

1. A Communist cannot in good faith take the lawyer's oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States since he is an agent of a conspiratorial apparatus designed to destroy the Constitution.

2. A Communist lawyer cannot be counted upon to carry out his duty to serve the interests of a client since he is under Communist discipline, which subordinates professional loyalties to the interests of the Communist Party.

3. A Communist lawyer violates the high standard of ethics and conduct, historically required of members of the bar, when he exploits the know-how and prestige of his profession in behalf of Communist propaganda, subversion, and espionage.

In the decade from 1947 through 1957, the report showed, more than 100 of the individuals identified before the committee as members of the Communist Party were also members of the bar.

Most of these lawyers have appeared as witnesses before this committee or other congressional committees. Approximately a dozen of them informed this committee that they were no longer part of the conspiracy and presented valuable testimony regarding their past activities as lawyers in the party. However, no less than 67 other lawyers have refused to answer questions of this committee or other congressional committees regarding their membership or activities in the Communist Party, despite the existence of sworn testimony regarding their affiliation with the conspiracy. All but four of these

¹ See "Communist Legal Subversion, The Role of the Communist Lawyer." Report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, H. Rept. 41, Feb. 16, 1959.

² See "Communist Political Subversion, The Campaign to Destroy the Security Programs of the United States Government." Report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, H. Rept. No. 1182, Aug. 16, 1957.

lawyers invoked the protection of the fifth amendment against self-incrimination in refusing to respond to questioning.

The report focused attention upon only a very small minority within the legal profession whose activities, the committee warned, should not be permitted to cast discredit upon the overwhelming majority of patriotic attorneys whose work is vital to the very functioning of our democratic processes. The committee also pointed out, however, that the paucity of lawyers who have been publicly identified as Communists must not be interpreted as meaning that their influence is insignificant and without danger, since in the legal field, as well as in other fields, the Communist Party emphasizes discipline and efficiency of members over mere numbers.

The committee explained that the principals in this operation enjoy a far disproportionate influence in the American community as a result of a combination of legal training, schooling in Communist subversive techniques, and the fact that they have behind them the entire Communist apparatus and are made the subjects of favorable publicity build-ups on the part of the Communist Party, its fronts, and fellow travelers in all walks of life.

Under the mantle of the legal profession, the Communist can operate as an ostensibly respectable and influential member of the community, despite his dedication and subservience to Communist doctrines and directives.

The mechanics of legal subversion, it was explained, extend far beyond any legitimate process of legal representation. They embrace the efforts of a conspiratorial minority, trained in the use of the legal instruments of our society, to turn those instruments into weapons for the destruction of our free society.

The scope and nature of their activities are such that Communist lawyers rank as part of an elite corps within the Communist fifth column on American soil, the report declared.

To illustrate the Communist lawyers' role in the promotion of the plans and purposes of the Communist Party, the report said:

In an effort to obtain a picture of some of the special services which can be performed for the Communist Party by members operating from the vantage point of the legal profession, the committee has reviewed the public record of a number of lawyers who have been identified as party members in sworn testimony. This record, which represents only publicly available information contained in the files of the committee, shows that such lawyers have:

1. Capitalized on their membership in the legal profession to recruit fellow lawyers into the Communist Party.

2. Misapplied their legal training by assisting Communist operatives in circumventing the law in order to carry out party objectives.

3. Served in secret Communist cells aimed at espionage and influencing United States policy toward Communist objectives, while holding responsible legal positions in the United States Government.

4. Carried out important duties as a functionary of the Communist Party organization itself.

5. Served as attorneys for both Communist-dominated trade unions and those not under Communist control.

6. Acted as legal advisers to, and accepted leadership roles in, organizations which posed as legitimate non-Communist enterprises although they were, in fact, operated under Communist control for party purposes—for example, the party front organizations built around “civil rights” and other popular themes.

7. Exploited the prestige of their profession in the course of running for public office.

The Communist Party has reaped inestimable benefits as a result of these extralegal activities of identified Communist lawyers. While the activities involve the promotion of Communist objectives in fields far removed from the atmosphere of courts or administrative and congressional hearing rooms, nevertheless, a basic element in all of them is a deliberate Communist exploitation of the lawyer's special status as a member of the bar.

Specific illustrations of each of these activities were selected from numerous examples available in the public records of identified Communist lawyers.

One of the methods by which Communist attorneys recruit fellow non-Communist lawyers into the party is through the means of so-called informal legal discussions. This was demonstrated in the testimony of a former Communist lawyer who had been led into formal party membership through regular attendance at such sessions, which were actually Marxist discussions aimed at the gradual indoctrination of non-Communist lawyers with Communist views.

Pointing up instances in which identified Communist lawyers have misapplied their legal training by helping Communist agents evade our laws, the committee recalled the case of Gerhart Eisler, an international Communist agent whose false passport application for travels in the service of the Communist conspiracy had been prepared by Leon Josephson, an openly admitted Communist and a member of the bar in New Jersey.

Among the cases used to illustrate Communist espionage and subversion by individuals who obtained positions of trust within the United States Government due to their legal training, were New York lawyers John J. Abt and Nathan Witt. These individuals, it was noted, held legal posts with the Department of Agriculture and the National Labor Relations Board, respectively, while serving as leaders of secret Communist cells composed of Government employees.

Members of the bar who have, at the same time, held important functionary posts within the Communist Party organization were exemplified in a résumé of the activities of San Francisco lawyer Aubrey W. Grossman and New York lawyer Abraham Unger. The report contains a detailed description of the services which these men have rendered to the Communist Party.

Noting that since the late 1920's the Communist Party has made concerted efforts to infiltrate the organized labor movement in this country, the committee described the contributions to this party objective made by six identified Communist lawyers. The success of the

operation was shown in the party's actual control of a number of the Nation's labor unions.

The behind-the-scenes operations of Communist-front organizations and the efforts to conceal the real Communist purpose behind their campaigns were also described in detail. The report demonstrated how identified Communist lawyers who assume prominent roles in the party's front organizations and special propaganda campaigns furnish extra legal service to the Communist Party. As candidates for public office and propagandists for Communist causes, Communist lawyers are particularly valuable to the conspiracy because lawyers are widely accepted by the public as especially qualified for public office and as authorities on legislation and constitutional law, the report said.

The committee expressed the belief that the Communist Party gains tremendously by having its members admitted to the bar, and stated:

* * * The party has obviously long been aware that a lawyer's special training and prestige can lead to positions of prominence in our society where he can wield substantial influence extending far beyond the limits of his routine professional activities. The Communist Party has also taken full advantage of the fact that non-Communists are not generally ready to suspect that anyone with the attainments and unique privileges of a lawyer would also serve as an agent of the Communist conspiracy.

Following the general description of the means by which a Communist lawyer can aid the conspiracy, the report presented a more detailed description of the publicly recorded activities of 39 lawyers who have been identified as members of the Communist Party.

Although the lawyers referred to represented only a small percentage of the identified Communists within the legal profession, they were selected for inclusion in the report because they exemplified patterns of activity which have aroused the concern of this committee. The factual material upon which this report was based did not include information on Communist lawyers who have not been publicly identified, nor on lawyers who are not actual party members for "security" or other reasons, but who nevertheless unswervingly support the Communist Party and its program. Nor did the report attempt to exhaust information on the subject which may be available as a result of hearings by other committees of the United States Congress, various State investigating committees, and governmental agencies, such as the Subversive Activities Control Board, or information obtained as a result of testimony in the numerous Smith Act trials.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA DISTRICT OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

A major reorganization of the Communist apparatus in California has sounded the gun for an invigorated campaign of subversion in that State.

This warning was issued by the committee in April 1959 in a special report³ summarizing the results of extensive staff investigations and

³ See "Report on the Southern California District of the Communist Party," H. Rept. 259, Committee on Un-American Activities, Apr. 3, 1959.

hearings in the area. The hearings, which embrace the testimony of 64 witnesses appearing in executive sessions in Los Angeles September 2-5, 1958, and February 24-25, 1959, were released concurrently with the special report.

Certain changes in Communist strategy accompanied the reorganization of the party's structure in California, the report disclosed. The committee noted that the reorganization was aimed at increasing the ability of the party to infiltrate and exert influence on important segments of the California community.

In ascribing motives for the revitalized Communist offensive in the State of California, the committee declared:

* * * Obviously, the Communist Party is alert to the potentials of the booming State. California's constantly increasing population, its burgeoning industries ranging from strategic aircraft and missile production to the building trades, its unique multi-million dollar entertainment center, and its mounting influence in the national political scene unfortunately have not only attracted the average loyal American but also the Nation's predatory Communist minority.

The committee report described in detail how the Communist Party structure in California has been reorganized since local party conventions were called to initiate the changes early in 1957.

The Communist Party in the United States is structurally divided into national, district, state, section, and club levels, with a hierarchy of officials on each level to channel orders from the top down to the mass of party members organized into local clubs. Previously the State of California had been combined with the States of Arizona, Nevada, and Hawaii in Communist Party District 13. The party's national organization has now paid tribute to the size and importance of the California Communist operation by creating two major party districts within California alone.

California has been divided into a Northern California District and a Southern California District of the Communist Party, USA. In view of the complexity of the new Communist structure, the committee confined the scope of its hearings and report to the new Southern California District, which is the second largest district, in terms of party membership, in the entire Communist Party organization in the United States.

The committee report noted that the reorganization created many new official party positions on the important district level. It identified many of the individuals who had been elevated to these new positions in the Southern California District of the party and, in biographical sketches, compared their present assignments with their previous local party activities. The new Southern California District, the report revealed, is supervised by a 62-member district council and a 10-man executive board selected from the council. Top district officers are Dorothy Healey, chairman, and Ben Dobbs, administrative secretary. In addition to identifying the members of the district executive board, the report presented biographies of 76 other prominent members of the Communist Party in southern California, many of whom had been elevated to new posts as a result of the party reorganization.

The activities and objectives of the Communists in southern California were also revealed in considerable detail. The report declared that the present Communist plan of operation—

calls for a massive Communist effort to penetrate every segment of the California community—industries, unions, major political parties, community and fraternal organizations, churches, and nationality groups—and then to spread Communist influence in those areas, recruit new Communists and put the party people into actual control wherever possible.

To substantiate this finding, the committee quoted extensively from statements made by officials of the Southern California District of the Communist Party. These statements came in part from documents prepared by the Communists for their first Southern California District convention, held in Los Angeles in April 1957. The documents were introduced by the committee as exhibits in its hearings and reproduced in its report on the southern California party apparatus. The committee quoted from subsequent discussions and decisions of the Southern California District Council, which holds monthly meetings in connection with its task of supervising Communist efforts in southern California.

In view of the all-out Communist effort to infiltrate and subvert existing respectable institutions and organizations, the report said, there has been less emphasis on the "front" organizations. The committee said only four major "front" organizations created or completely controlled by the Communist Party continue to operate in the southern California area. These are the Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, the American Russian Institute of Southern California, the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms, and the Downtown Club (an ostensibly non-partisan community betterment organization in downtown Los Angeles).

The committee called attention to a number of recent decisions by the national leadership of the Communist Party which had a significant impact on the local party. The decisions dealt with Communist efforts to win support among youth, the Negro, and the labor movement.

In response to repeated appeals from national party officials for increased local efforts to attract youth into the conspiracy, a Youth Commission was created by the Southern California District of the Communist Party in 1958 and a paid party functionary was assigned to youth recruitment on a full-time basis. The redoubled efforts of southern California Communists in this field led to the formation in Los Angeles of three youth clubs. The purpose of these clubs formed by the local party is to spur their non-Communist members into an acceptance of communism.

The committee report noted that an important change in the Communist Party line regarding the Negro had unusual repercussions in the Southern California District of the party. In 1958, the National Committee of the Communist Party decided to abandon a 30-year-old doctrine that American Negroes constituted a disenfranchised "national grouping" which, with Communist help, could some day become a Negro "nation." This line, imposed on American Com-

munists in the late 1920's by Moscow, has impeded the party in its efforts to obtain influence among the Negro population of this country. A resolution adopted by the party's National Committee in 1958 flatly declared that "the Negro people of the United States are not constituted as a separately developed nation."

The committee's inquiry in southern California disclosed, however, that the new policy has created dissension between Negro and white party officials of the Southern California District. Negro party leaders have opposed the new policy, while white party leaders have hailed it as an aid to their efforts to enter and work within non-Communist organizations.

Southern California Communists, the committee report stated, have also been assisted by a National Committee statement of policy in regard to the labor movement. The policy statement, adopted in June of 1958, falsely attempts to persuade the non-Communist American labor movement that Communists should be welcomed because they will fight staunchly for legitimate labor interests. To further increase the effectiveness of party efforts to obtain influence in the labor field, the Southern California District of the Communist Party subsequently shifted all of its party members active in the labor movement into special occupational clubs. Previously, many trade union members of the party had met in local community clubs for Communists of diverse occupations within a common geographical area.

The committee report dealt at length with local aspects of the Communist Party's internal disputes which erupted after the death of Stalin and the public revelation of his "crimes." In 1957, the report stated, the party in southern California was "in a turmoil" as a certain group of dissenters within the party became "loud and argumentative." Many dissenters felt that the party must cast off subservience to the Soviet Union. In December 1957, 22 members of the southern California party signed a letter of grievance to the party's National Committee and on March 26, 1958, 16 members from southern California officially resigned.

The correspondence of the dissenters and the identity of many of them are described in the committee report. Although District Chairman Dorothy Healey acted as a conciliator in these conflicts in an effort to preserve the unity and existence of the party organization in southern California, the report declared that she herself was accused of being a dissenter when she attended sessions of the National Committee, of which she is also a member.

WHO ARE THEY?

KARL MARX

Today Communist Party officials boast that there are over 33 million Communist Party members in the world and that over 900 million people live under Communist rule or are governed by political and economic systems based on some specific form or general synthesis of the doctrines of Karl Marx.

Inasmuch as the Communist officials insist that they are following the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the Committee on Un-American Activities published, as Part 10 of its biographical series of Communist leaders, a brief biography of Karl Marx.⁴

⁴ See "Who Are They? Part 10—Karl Marx," Committee on Un-American Activities, Aug. 28, 1959.

In previous years the committee has published biographies on the following: Nikita Khrushchev, Nikolai Bulganin, Mao Tse-tung, Chou En-lai, Marshals Zhukov and Konev, Walter Ulbricht, Janos Kadar, Marshal Tito, Wladyslaw Gomulka, Kim Il Sung, Ho Chi Minh, Maurice Thorez, Palmiro Togliatti, Vicente Lombardo Toledano, Luis Carlos Prestes, Enver Hoxha, and Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej.

To properly analyze the roots of communism, it must be viewed through the prism which is the life of Karl Marx himself. The biography of Karl Marx, which was prepared for the Committee on Un-American Activities by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, is not intended as a thoroughgoing treatment of the life and works of Marx. Rather, it is a glimpse at the mysterious processes of a life which produced the ideological base for the most devilish and menacing force mankind has ever experienced.

COMMUNIST LOBBYING ACTIVITIES IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

In a report issued on September 3, 1959, the committee revealed that the Communist conspiracy is engaged in an accelerated lobbying operation in the Nation's Capital.⁵

On the surface, the report declared, this lobbying operation cannot be easily distinguished from that of thousands of legitimate organizations which retain Washington representatives to lobby for or against pending national legislation.

Lobbyists for Communist-controlled organizations even comply to a large extent with technical requirements of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act by registering and filing fairly regular reports with the proper officers of the House and the Senate regarding the amount and source of funds they expend in their attempt to influence the actions of individual Members of the Congress.

Although these lobbyists for Red-dominated organizations appear to operate within the technicalities of the law, their lobbying efforts, in effect, defeat the basic congressional purpose behind passage of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act in 1946.

LOBBYING AS A DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

Congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom of speech * * * or the right of the people * * * to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The first amendment to the United States Constitution thus provides that, in a representative government responsive to the will of the people, all citizens have the right to express their needs and desires to the legislators they have elected.

Lobbying, therefore, in the general sense that citizens address or solicit Members of the Congress in an effort to influence the passage of legislation that accords with their own particular interests, is a legitimate ingredient of the legislative process. As a practical matter, this expression of diverse and inevitably conflicting interests by various segments of the American population can be extremely helpful to Members of the Congress in their attempt to legislate for the public good.

⁵ See "Communist Lobbying Activities in the Nation's Capital," Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Sept. 3, 1959.

The committee declared, however, that the increasing number of professional lobbyists—who are hired by an organization or individual to promote certain legislative interests in Washington—created special problems for the Congress. Some paid lobbyists (presently estimated to total no less than 5,000) concealed their real purposes from Members of Congress in seeking to influence their actions with respect to pending legislation.⁶

Asserting its right to know the exact nature of the representations made by professional lobbyists, the Congress in 1946 adopted the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. Thereafter, persons who solicited, collected, or received money for the principal purpose of influencing legislation, were to register with authorities of the House and Senate and file regular reports under oath regarding their exact legislative purpose, their employing organizations, and the receipt and expenditure of funds in connection with their lobbying activities.

In the 13 years since the Congress devised the Lobbying Act for determining the source of certain pressures upon it, congressional committees have accumulated extensive evidence on the strategy and tactics of the unique "special interest" group—the Communist conspiracy.

As a result of such evidence, the Congress itself declared the Communist Party to be a foreign-directed instrument for forceful overthrow of our constitutional Government and enacted a great deal of legislation designed to curb the effectiveness of the American tentacles of an increasingly aggressive and powerful world movement.

Hearings and reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities reveal that operations of the American tools of Soviet imperialism continue unabated. The cunning of the Communist conspirators is perhaps best demonstrated by their proven efforts to pervert many of our democratic processes of government for their own unholy objectives.

The committee's report on "Communist Political Subversion," issued in August 1957, disclosed a Communist campaign to wipe out our Nation's security measures against Communists by means of a simulated "grass roots" pressure on Federal and local governments.

The committee released a report entitled "Communist Legal Subversion,"⁷ which revealed that identified Communists had gained entry into the legal profession, where they were in a unique position to serve as instruments to destroy the very democratic processes a lawyer is sworn to defend.

Consistent with such Communist tactics is the exploitation of the lobbying process, this subsequent committee report said. The committee asserted that its investigations showed that Communist-dominated organizations have increasingly engaged lobbyists in order to establish continuous direct contact with Members of the Congress on Capitol Hill. Thousands of dollars are being spent each month by such organizations in their bold attempt to influence the Nation's legislators.

The lobbying operation, the committee warned, constitutes only one small fraction of the total Communist effort designed to make an impact on the Government. The committee report also did not pur-

⁶ See p. 27, S. Rept. 1400, to accompany S. 2177, May 31, 1946.

⁷ See "Communist Legal Subversion: The Role of the Communist Lawyer," H. Rept. No. 41, February 16, 1959.

port to embrace the lobbying activities in Washington of Communists, or other persons connected with Communist organizations, who are not required to register under the Lobbying Act because they are not engaged in lobbying for pay.

EMERGENCY CIVIL LIBERTIES COMMITTEE LOBBY

After extended investigation and hearings, the Committee on Un-American Activities formally advised the Congress in its annual report for 1958 that “* * * the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, established in 1951, although representing itself as a non-Communist group, actually operates as a front for the Communist Party.”⁸

One of the chief activities of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which has headquarters in New York City, involves the dissemination of Communist propaganda material, although it also supplies funds and legal aid to Communists being prosecuted under the Smith Act or other legislation. In 1957, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee became the spearhead of a propaganda campaign aimed at extinguishing the investigative powers of the Congress in the field of subversive activities, restricting functions of the FBI in the same field, and generally fostering a climate of opinion against the exposure and punishment of subversion. Through the media of printed literature and public meetings, the organization sought to stimulate citizens into writing and visiting their elected representatives in furtherance of this campaign.⁹

On January 4, 1959, this same Emergency Civil Liberties Committee boldly opened a Washington office near the United States Capitol, the committee report observed. On January 21, 1959, the organization's director, Clark Foreman, executed forms registering himself as lobbying agent for the ECLC.

From congressional lobbying records, it might appear that a new and legitimate organization in the civil liberties field had initiated direct congressional contacts for the purpose of influencing the course of legislation. Scrutinized in the light of information available in the Committee on Un-American Activities, the action signaled a new effort by the Communist conspiracy to obtain its objectives by clever exploitation of the lobbying process, the committee declared.

The appearance of Clark Foreman as registered lobbying agent of the ECLC was described as not unexpected in view of his previous experience in other cited front organizations for the Communist Party. He was president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, registering as a lobbyist for the organization in 1946. He later served as director of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. Foreman divides his time between Washington and the New York headquarters of the front organization he now serves as director. The Washington office of the ECLC also produces a weekly bulletin titled “Congress and Your Rights” which, Foreman reported, has been mailed to some 500 persons since January 1959. His lobbyist reports list the expenditure of some \$1,500 in the first quarter of 1959 for the purpose of influencing legislation in the Nation's Capital.

⁸ See H. Rept. 187, Annual Report for the year 1958, released Mar. 8, 1959, pp. 34, 35; the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee was also characterized as a Communist front by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in its Handbook for Americans, issued in 1956.

⁹ See “Operation Abolition,” report by the Committee on Un-American Activities, Nov. 8, 1957, for further details of this campaign by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and various affiliated organizations.

The entry of the ECLC into the professioned lobbying arena augments pressures which have long been exerted by a number of unions found to be under the domination of the Communist Party, the report stated. Such Red-led unions as the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, and the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers—all have paid lobbyists operating in the Nation's Capital.

The committee report discusses in detail the background and activities of the lobbyists representing each of these Red-led organizations in the Nation's Capital.

In concluding this report, the committee called attention to the statement by Lenin:

As long as you are unable to disperse the bourgeois parliament and every other type of reactionary institution, you must work inside them. * * * ¹⁰

Lenin issued this commandment to the disciples of communism in non-Communist nations many years ago. And he clearly specified that Communists must use parliamentary bodies "for revolutionary purposes"—that is, to prepare the "backward masses" for the eventual imposition of a "Soviet system" of government.

Once communism is achieved in a country, however, the very concept of "parliamentarism" will be "obsolete," Lenin said.¹¹ Or as the Communist International declared more bluntly:

* * * Communism repudiates parliamentarism as the form of the future * * * its aim is to destroy parliamentarism. Therefore it is only possible to speak of utilizing the bourgeois State organizations with the object of destroying them.¹²

The history of nations which have succumbed to Red dictatorships offers tragic evidence that parliamentarianism is indeed doomed when in the hands of Communists. The vestiges of parliamentarianism that remain in the rubber stamp "legislatures" of Soviet and satellite nations are obviously only attempts to make communism more palatable to the dwindling portion of the world that remains free.

In view of the Communists attitude toward parliamentary institutions, the committee expressed the belief that Members of Congress have every right to question the motives of legislative representatives who deal with them on legislative matters while in the hire of organizations found dominated by the Communist Party.

The committee report recommended enactment of an amendment to the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act so that the registered lobbyist in the future would have the duty to inform the Congress of any Communist connections of his own or of the organizations which he represents. The chairman of the committee subsequently introduced H.R. 9054 in keeping with the committee's recommendations. The provisions of the bill are described on page 134 of this report where the committee's legislative recommendations are discussed.

¹⁰ Lenin, "Left-Wing Communism—An Infantile Disorder" (1920), Selected Works (New York: International Publishers, 1943), vol. X, p. 95.

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 100, 106.

¹² "Theses and Statutes of the Communist International," adopted at 2nd World Congress, Moscow, July 17–August 7, 1920.

THE COMMUNIST PARCEL OPERATION

A parcel operation in the United States, under the direction and control of the Communist regimes of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union, is netting the international Communist movement millions of dollars every year as a tribute levied against the friends and relatives of the subjects of the Kremlin, the committee stated in a report entitled, "The Communist Parcel Operation."¹³

Characterizing the parcel operation as blackmail, the committee pointed out that the Communist regimes do not permit CARE to operate within the Soviet Union or the satellite countries, except, recently, Poland; that, instead, the Communist governments maintain agents in the United States who collect exorbitant duties and fees ranging up to 250% of the value of the relief items sent behind the Iron Curtain by American citizens.

The report, which was based on several months' committee investigation followed by executive hearings, stated that the millions of dollars thus collected on exorbitant duties and fees from American citizens for the privilege of sending relief parcels to friends and relatives behind the Iron Curtain are used to finance Communist activities within the free world.

A similar Communist operation is conducted in Canada, the report continued, where the sum of \$20 to \$30 million yearly is collected by Soviet agents as customs duties on food and clothing parcels sent by Canadian citizens to the Soviet Union, and that this sum is used to finance the activities of Communists in Canada.

In a foreword to the report, the chairman of the committee stated:

In determining whether or not to publish the accompanying report on the Communist parcel operation, the Committee on Un-American Activities was faced with the possibility that the resulting adverse public opinion in the free world might cause the Kremlin to ban the admission of relief parcels to its subjects. The committee is of the opinion, however, that the millions of dollars in blackmail which the Communist regimes are annually extracting in their parcel operation would weigh heavier in the minds of the masters of the Kremlin than adverse public opinion in the free world.

According to a careful study of the available financial records of the numerous gift parcel companies licensed by four Communist states to operate in the United States as their agents, these countries were enriched by the following sums collected as import duties and fees in the United States during the period 1950-1958 alone:

U.S.S.R.....	\$15, 000, 000
Hungary.....	10, 000, 000
Czechoslovakia.....	4, 800, 000
Poland *.....	18, 000, 000
	\$47, 800, 000

* The \$18,000,000 listed as income of the Polish Government covers the years 1954-1958 only, figures for previous years not being available.

¹³ See "The Communist Parcel Operation," Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, September 25, 1959.

The Soviet Union has been operating a gift-parcel business in the United States for nearly 30 years. Originally, it maintained a chain of stores in the principal cities of the Soviet Union which were stocked with items produced in the United States and other Western countries—items of the type that were rationed or unavailable to Soviet citizens. Rubles were nonnegotiable in these stores. Only hard foreign currencies were accepted. The Soviet Union advertised these stores abroad and encouraged the sending of foreign currencies to the residents of the Soviet Union so they could make purchases in them.

Later, the Soviet Government licensed travel companies in this country to serve as dollar collecting agencies, and also to accept parcels for shipment to the U.S.S.R.—after collecting exorbitant import duties and other fees for them. In the 1930's, one of these companies, World Tourists, Inc., served as a cover for Soviet espionage operations.

The primary purpose of the Communist parcel operation in the United States is to collect as many U.S. dollars as it possibly can for the international Communist conspiracy "to finance Communist activities within the free world where the money was originally collected," the committee report stated. For this reason, among others, the Soviet Union has never permitted within its borders any relief activity which would impair the flow of American dollars into its treasury. CARE, a private relief organization which shipped millions of dollars to the needy in Europe immediately after World War II, was never allowed to operate in the Soviet Union. In recent years there has been criticism of the exorbitant fees charged by the Soviet Government for gift parcels. Largely because of this the government announced early last year that there would be a big price reduction on the cost of sending gift parcels. The actual effect of this so-called reduction, however, was to increase the sum of money collected by the Soviet Union on each parcel. A president of one of the gift parcel companies, while testifying before the committee, explained how this was possible:

They [Intourist officials] came here to attend the convention of the American Society of Travel Agents which took place in New York which I attended and of which I am an officer. They advised us that they were somewhat perturbed by some unfavorable publicity that Russia got in connection with this parcel business and the Russians are very sensitive about public relations, or at least they have been lately. They suggested that we reduce our charges. We protested vigorously. * * * At last I told them that the dissatisfaction arises not from the little fees we get but from the duties that they charge and they said: "We have decided to reduce our duties." Then they brought us a draft, I don't remember whether it was written or oral, of the new system. Up until January 1, the duty on most of the items was computed ad valorem at 50 percent, 75 percent and 100 percent, plus 10 percent.

The new system called for set or stated duties on certain items in accordance with the list I just turned in to you for the record. * * *

Under this new system of set duties on items such as men's suits, the Soviet Union is collecting more money than it did under the old system. This is because the parcel companies, in order to encourage business, formerly appraised suits far below their actual value. The duty collected for the Soviet Union on them was, therefore, much less than it should have been according to the old rates.

THE SATELLITE OPERATION

At the end of World War II, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, the three Communist nations which now have parcel operations in the United States, were free countries. CARE operated within their borders, and Americans sent millions of dollars of relief to citizens of these countries duty free. As the Communists took over each of these countries, they forced CARE out and set up relief parcel operations of their own designed to alleviate somewhat the suffering of their own citizens and to enrich to a great extent their own coffers.

The satellite parcel operation differs from that of the Soviet Union in that relief items are not actually transported from the United States. Each of these governments has established a special department which runs a chain of stores which stock a wide selection of merchandise, including not only food and clothing, but items such as electrical appliances and even building materials. U.S. companies licensed to represent these Communist government agencies take orders for items stocked by these stores, either singly or in a variety of prepackaged parcels. There is also a free-choice arrangement whereby the recipient is permitted to purchase any item he wants to up to the value of the sum in dollars given to the U.S. company by his benefactor. The recipient is then notified of the gift and goes to the government store to pick up his material.

The Polish Government has gone to greater lengths than any of the others to attract transmittals of stable currency and has collected more American dollars in the last 8 years than any of the other countries. Residents of Poland are not only permitted to possess U.S. dollars today, but are also given favorable rates for exchanging them for Polish currency or for goods sold at the government warehouses. In this way the flow of dollars to Poland—and to the Polish treasury—is greatly enhanced.

FACTS ON COMMUNISM¹⁴

The Committee on Un-American Activities this year published the first volume of a series entitled, "Facts on Communism." The series, when completed, will be an encyclopedia on communism designed to give a comprehensive, authoritative, and fully documented survey of communism in both its theoretical and practical aspects.

This volume and succeeding volumes to be published are the fruit of collaboration between the committee's research staff and a number of eminent scholars with specialized knowledge of certain aspects of communism.

¹⁴ See "Facts on Communism," vol. I, "The Communist Ideology," Committee on Un-American Activities, December 1959. The supply of this publication for distribution by the committee is limited but copies may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., for 45 cents per copy.

With the release of Volume I of "Facts on Communism," the chairman of the committee stated:

Ignorance of communism is our greatest weakness in today's total struggle with the Communist conspiracy. Communism is a cancer which attacks the body politic and brings about the downfall of entire governments, just as cancer itself attacks and destroys human bodies. Without a thorough knowledge of communism, we can no more hope to survive and conquer it than we can hope to defeat cancer without authoritative and reliable knowledge of its nature.

I hope that this monumental work in its completed form will be the object of serious study, not only by the Members of the Congress for whom it is initially intended, but by all who are concerned with the Communist menace.

Volume I presents a survey of the body of ideas that make up the Communist ideology. The survey is in the form of an interpretation of the Communist "classical" authorities and also includes criticism of at least the fundamental ideas. The system and the interconnection of the various parts of Communist ideology have been analyzed and interpreted by Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer. Extensive quotations from Communist classics document his analysis. A professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame, Dr. Niemeyer's competence in this field is attested by the fact that he teaches graduate courses on Communist ideology and, with Dr. John S. Reshetar, Jr., is coauthor of the book, "An Inquiry Into Soviet Mentality." Dr. Niemeyer was born in Germany but left that country on the advent of Hitler to power. Educated in England and Germany, he has taught in the United States at Princeton, Oglethorpe, Yale, and Columbia Universities. He has served a planning adviser in the Department of State, research analyst in the Council on Foreign Relations, and as a member of the resident faculty of the National War College. He is coeditor of the *Handbook on Communism*, published in a German edition in 1958 and about to appear in its English edition.

The committee declared in an introduction to the first volume of Facts on Communism that communism is called, by its own followers, a "philosophy in action." As a philosophy, it is characterized by a basic attitude of uncompromising hostility to all non-Communist societies and the ideas held in them. Beyond this, however, it is a philosophy armed with means of power.

At present, the committee warned, communism has concentrated its hostility on the United States as the most powerful among the nations not yet under its sway. The United States thus finds itself under attack by an enemy whose motive for hostility is not any practical grievance or limited aspiration but rather the basic will to destroy the order of life in the United States in order to make room for a Communist rule.

The enemy has engaged us on many fronts at once, the introduction continued. In the field of international power relations, he has pursued an aggressive policy seeking to isolate the United States in order to destroy our power, an objective toward which he has pressed, with or without war, by means of diplomacy, propaganda, trade, and sub-

version. In the framework of internal political and social order, the enemy has sought to influence, paralyze, or disintegrate the processes of our common life, operating under the facade of ostensibly responsible citizenship. In the realm of ideas, finally, the enemy has attempted to use many kinds of intellectual and cultural activities (education, science, literature, art) in order to destroy all loyalties other than those to Communist leadership.

This multifarious attack, unprecedented in history, differs so much from the normal pattern of relations between nations or political groups within nations that many people fail to grasp the full extent of the threat, the committee said. Some tend to mistake communism for a mere part of what it is and does. Others are not informed about the concealed aspects of communism. Still others find the Communist philosophy strange and incomprehensible.

Volume I of *Facts on Communism* analyzes and explains Communist doctrine under five general headings: the Communist view of history; the Communist view of present society; the revolution; dogma on the organization and strategy of the Communist Party; and communism as a philosophy.

In discussing the Communist view of history, it is pointed out that "the very core of communism" is a "complete theory about how history moves, why it moves, and the direction in which it moves." The centerpiece of this theory of history is the doctrine of the class struggle which "serves as a guiding criterion to all Communist thinking about society and politics." The concept of class struggle is then discussed, in particular its role in providing the Communists with an explanation of history. Historical materialism and dialectical materialism are explained in this section of the work, which concludes that:

It is a mistake to say that communism is a blueprint for future society. It is rather the pretense of a foreknowledge of history, a trust in a beneficent outcome of a ruthless struggle for revolutionary power.

Another major section of the volume, dealing with "The Communist View of the Present Society," discusses Marx's and Lenin's ideas of what Communists must think of present society and how they must act in it, in view of the orientation of their ideology toward the future. Here are found comprehensive descriptions of Marx's and Lenin's views on capitalism, with an extremely illuminating account of how Lenin drastically reinterpreted Marx on the subject. In Communist ideology from Marx to the present day, however, the document states, the revolutionary has consistently been required to look upon "present-day society" as—

something that is utterly corrupt as well as utterly doomed, so that one need take no interest in its problems other than to the end of hastening its collapse and of detaching the masses from its authorities.

The third section of Volume I, *Facts on Communism*, deals with the "Socialist Revolution" which, together with the philosophy of history, is described as the "core of Communist ideology." The Communist concept of "revolution" is different from other concepts of popular uprisings, because it is a doctrine of revolution as a "necessary" event

in the process of history, rather than in terms of relief of human suffering or realization of people's hopes. The vast changes made by Lenin in Marx's concept of the revolution are discussed at length, particularly Lenin's insistence on viewing the revolution as "protracted struggle" rather than the one great convulsive crisis predicted by Marx.

A major section of the volume outlines Communist doctrine relating to the organization and strategy of the Communist Party. These ideas were developed by Lenin as he sought to build the Communist Party into a kind of "ideological-military army designed to destroy, conquer, and hold positions of power with means ranging from terror to trickery." Among the ideological concepts which arose on the subject of the Communist Party were the party's alleged advanced insight into historical truth and, therefore, its presumed infallibility; and party relations with the masses of non-Communists. In this section is also discussed the "most confused, inherently contradictory and hypocritical" part of Communist doctrine—the Communist teaching about the state. The role played by the Soviet Union in Communist ideology is also shown. By becoming an instrument of the Communist revolution, the Soviet Union's objectives of expansion have become intertwined with, and indistinguishable from, Communist ideological aims.

A final chapter demonstrates that philosophy is the "real basis of Communist ideology" from the beginning to the present day:

In its present form it has, however, gone far beyond the scope of Marx's ideas and has expanded into a comprehensive system which pretends to have answers for all questions and guiding principles for all fields of human action.

This chapter describes the philosophical impulse for Marxism, stemming from the 19th century philosophers Hegel and Feuerbach, and shows how Communist ideology has combined materialism and dialectics into one philosophy—dialectical materialism. The Communist view of religion and ethics is also presented. The volume notes that:

By its combination of a program of action with a philosophy the Marxist world view became a substitute for religion to many who reject religion and still want a system explaining fully the meaning of life.

CHAPTER IV

CONSULTATIONS

LANGUAGE AS A COMMUNIST WEAPON

Dr. STEFAN T. POSSONY

March 2, 1959

Manipulation of language constitutes one of the Communists' most potent weapons in their drive for world domination, Dr. Stefan T. Possony,¹ political scientist of Georgetown University and authority on psychological warfare and revolution, stated in a consultation. "To the Communists," he said, "words are tools to achieve effects, not means to communicate in the search for truth."

Dr. Possony explained that, in their early years, the Communists developed a "revolutionary" language of their own which they used not only in their doctrinal works, but also in their propaganda. Because the language included terms such as "class warfare," "terrorism," "labor armies," and "revolution," it revealed the real nature of the Communist movement and "hurt the Communists a great deal," repelling, rather than attracting, most people.

At the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern in 1935, it was decided that Communists would no longer use this "sectarian language." This meant—

that the Communist message should be couched in terms which have a positive ring in the ears of the audience. Communism must be dressed up as something like democratic liberalism or patriotic nationalism. Offensive and locally unfamiliar terms must be avoided * * * any good Communist would now be able to use language which is not to be found in the classical writings of Marx and Lenin but occurs in Jefferson, Mill—or Jane Addams.

"The Communists did not change their basic texts," Dr. Possony continued, "but cleaned up the language which they addressed to the noninitiated"—

Of course, Communist terminology could not be cleaned up entirely, but, briefly, "revolution" became "liberation,"

¹ See "Language As A Communist Weapon," Consultation with Dr. Stefan T. Possony, Committee on Un-American Activities, March 2, 1959.

Dr. Possony is the author of "A Century of Conflict," "Tomorrow's War," "Strategic Air Power," and "International Relations" (with Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupé). He has been on the faculty of Georgetown University since 1946. He was born in Austria, educated there and in Germany, and holds a Ph.D. degree from the University of Vienna. After the Anschluss, he made his way to Paris and worked for the French Foreign and Air Ministries. He came to the United States in 1941 and joined the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton on a Carnegie fellowship.

He later served with the Psychological Warfare Branch, Office of Naval Intelligence, where he headed the German Section. In 1952 he served on the faculty of the National War College in Washington, D.C., and in 1955 became an associate of the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania. He has taught courses on communism, psychological warfare, geopolitics, political philosophy, and on strategy and revolution in the 20th Century. He is currently a trustee of the American Military Institute and a member of the editorial boards of *Air Power Historian* and of *Orbis*, a quarterly on world affairs published by the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania.

and the physical extermination of entire groups of people, "classes," and nations became the "laying of the foundations of socialism." Occasionally, even the word "communism" disappeared from the vocabulary and was replaced by "antifascism" or, more recently, "anti-imperialism" * * *.

Lenin, who invented, among Communists, those tactics of language, occasionally even abandoned the use of his favorite word, "revolution"; instead, he talked about *the* reform, which he contrasted to *reforms*.

Dr. Possony analyzed, in his consultation, what Communists actually mean by the high-sounding terms they most frequently use today to mislead people concerning their true intentions—"national self-determination," "people's democracies," "coexistence," "liberation," "democracy," "scientific materialism," and also what they mean by smear words such as "reactionary" and "war monger."

When asked, for example, what Communists mean by the word "peace," Dr. Possony said:

Oh, that is simple: The non-Communist state does not defend itself while it is taken over or destroyed. To them "peace" means lack of resistance, or Communist operations without the admixture of violent and, specifically, military, means. It specifically *does not mean* the cessation of attempts at conquest nor the end of the "class war." In another context, "peace," for the Communists, signifies preparation for battle and war.

He emphasized that Communists used the word "peace" as both a tactical term and as a long-term objective:

Peace as a tactical term means, from their point of view, the temporarily exclusive utilization of nonviolent means of conflict; that is, propaganda, infiltration, political warfare, economic warfare, and "revolutions from within," methods suitable for conquest without risk * * *.

As an ultimate objective, "peace" simply means Communist world control. In their Communist world, there would be a proletarian world dictator. Societies no longer would be cleaved by classes and, in the "ultimate ultimate," nations and languages would be merged. There would be no socio-economic basis for conflict. This would be the society of eternal peace, * * *.

Dr. Possony pointed out that there is no peace in the world today and there will be none, according to the Communist interpretation of that word, until they have conquered the world:

The point is * * * that the Communists operate under the concept of class struggle, * * * and this struggle, conflict, or warfare never ceases *irrespective* of whether people are being killed in military battle.

War in the sense of firepower exchanges is *one* band in a whole spectrum of conflict techniques * * *.

* * * with varying intensities, conflict is incessant. It never stops before the final destruction of all enemies of the party * * *.

Propaganda does not stop. Political warfare does not stop. Infiltration does not stop. The class war, the class struggle, or as it is styled in modern Communist semantics, the struggle between the peace-loving and the imperialist, war-mongering forces, never stops. All these things go on. * * * as preparations for a later military phase of the conflict * * *.

Dr. Possony described the Communist concept of coexistence in these words:

The bone "coexists" with the dog; the rope "coexists" with the man who is hanged; bacilli "coexist" with your body. Coexistence is a transitory matter of fact. The Soviet Union is there; the United States is in existence; and as of today, the 2nd of March 1959, both states live, and various social systems exist, side by side. For the time being, the Soviets cannot stop coexisting with non-Communist nations * * *.

Coexistence is a temporary situation, and it is a description of fact. It also is a slogan to lull non-Communists to sleep and to induce economic and political support for the Soviet Union.

It specifically does *not* mean that any Communists ought to be prepared to coexist with the capitalist system till the end of the world. Essentially, the term is a deception to convey the impression that the world revolution has been called off.

Two of the roots of Communist semantics or language manipulation, Dr. Possony said, are:

Every Communist communication must convey an orthodox, that is, revolutionarily activating message to the party and its followers.

This same communication must convey a different, i.e., soothing, pacifying, and paralyzing message to the opponent of communism.

The West's difficulty in countering the Communist semantic weapon, he continued, is due to the following:

"Massive" Communist propaganda is poured into the West through statements, books, and broadcasts. It is knowingly spread by some people and sometimes unknowingly by others who are trying, ineffectively, to refute it.

Only a "trickle" of corrections come from Western governments, many of which "have essentially decided not to correct Communist * * * distortions."

The 100-year record of communism and 40-year record of the U.S.S.R. is not presented to the free peoples of the world. Many university texts on communism and the Soviet Union "are distorted, often are false, and usually lack depth of perception."

Many Western statesmen are unaware of the "brute facts" about communism when they negotiate with Soviet leaders. Moreover, they aren't interested, in some cases, in understanding the Communist "grand design." In addition, unfortunately, domestic politics tend to frame foreign policy in the West.

Also:

The Western World simply does not recognize the fact that political warfare, subversion, infiltration, and preparations for war are routine operations for any political system which has any aggressive designs.

Two points made by Dr. Possony in his consultation emphasize the great danger this country faces in communism. One was the following statement made by Mao Tse-tung to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party in 1938:

Every communist must grasp the truth: "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun" * * * we can even say that the whole world can be remoulded only with the gun * * * war can only be abolished through war—in order to get rid of the gun, we must first grasp it in our hand * * * the central task and the supreme form of a revolution is the seizure of political power by force of arms and the solution of problems by war.

The second point made by Dr. Possony was that the Communists proclaim their power to punish for anti-Soviet activity, not only the citizens of Communist nations, but the citizens of any nation in the world—and that they have exercised this power on more than one occasion.

The (Soviet) Ukrainian Criminal Code, for example, provided that—

those in foreign countries whose occupation or the institution to which they belong may expose the Soviet Union to war or may in any other way endanger the structure of the Soviet State will be punished by death or imprisonment.

COMMUNIST PERSECUTION OF CHURCHES IN RED CHINA AND NORTHERN KOREA

REV. PETER CHU PONG
REV. SHIH-PING WANG
REV. TSIN-TSAI LIU
REV. SAMUEL W. S. CHENG
Mr. KYUNG RAI KIM

March 26, 1959

Five Protestant leaders from Formosa, Hong Kong, and Southern Korea described the persecution and horrible atrocities visited on Christians in Communist China and Northern Korea by the Communist governments.² Their testimony reveals that these governments, like that of the Soviet Union, are engaged in an intense campaign to wipe out all vestiges of Christianity in areas under their control.

Rev. Peter Chu Pong, general secretary of the Hong Kong International Christian Leadership, told how the Communists, after taking over China in 1949, began to persecute the churches there. They came to him and to other ministers, demanding complete information

² See "Communist Persecution of Churches in Red China and Northern Korea, Consultation with Five Church Leaders," Committee on Un-American Activities, March 26, 1959.

on his church's income, the earnings of its members, a detailed accounting of daily expenditures, and information on contacts with foreign missionaries. They "borrowed" from him his religious books—and then never returned them. They set up indoctrination classes in his church to brainwash his congregation. These classes stressed three points:

1. Denial of a living God; the teaching of creation through evolution.

2. Denial of Christ as God. They said He was simply a common carpenter who had been crucified by the people because he wanted to lead a counterrevolution.

3. Christianity is a "religious instrument of foreign imperialists" to poison the Chinese people and "sell them into slavery."

The Communists held accusation meetings to charge Rev. Pong, his wife, and the elders and deacons of his church with being imperialists. They were forced to kneel on the platform of the church assembly hall with their hands tied and a sign which said "Guilty Crime" hanging from their necks:

They slapped our faces, kicked our bodies, and poured cold water on our heads. They made my children stand and watch. If they cried, the Communists beat them.

Rev. Pong and his wife were imprisoned after the accusation meeting. Each day for 46 days they were given only one meal. He was then suddenly released and told that "the people" of the Communist government had granted him "real mercy." He eventually escaped from Nanking to Shanghai, Canton, and finally Hong Kong. His wife escaped to Hong Kong in 1951.

There are no longer any truly Christian churches operating in Red China, Rev. Pong continued. The only ones in existence are propaganda churches operated by the Communists with Communist ministers "picked by the government to fill the pulpits and indoctrinate the people in communism."

Describing the incentive the Communists offer to the young people of Red China to join the Communist Party, Rev. Pong said in part:

In fifteen years, they are told, Red China will surpass the United States. They are told they will be the masters of the whole world; that by 1965 Red China will be celebrating their victories in San Francisco.

Despite such inducements, the young people of Red China make up the greatest proportion of escapees from the mainland. There is general unrest among the population and "the people on the mainland will never be satisfied until another revolution sweeps the present regime away."

Rev. Shih-ping Wang, East Asia director of the Baptist Evangelization Society International, described at some length the commune system recently instituted in Red China. This system has hurt the churches, he said, because it has given the government much more complete control of the people and all worship has been forbidden in the communes. The system works in the following manner:

The family unit is broken up. Husbands and wives are separated into different barracks. The children are taken

away from the parents and placed in government-run nurseries. * * * The parents may see their children once a week and when they see them they cannot show affection toward their children. The idea is to have the children and the family sever their affection and direct it toward the state. Names are taken away from the children, and they are given numbers. There is no individual identity. The basic unit of social life in the commune is the commune itself.

The people have resisted the communes. One step they took was to kill their livestock when the system was being instituted. A shortage of pork in Hong Kong, which relies largely on mainland China for that meat, resulted from this. The farmers also burned their crops. At the present time active, open opposition to the Communist government is confined to groups of guerrillas who have fled to the mountains.

Visitors to the mainland, Rev. Wang said, are unaware of the true facts about life under the commune system because what they see—

is just a guided tour. They take them where they want to take them and let them see and hear only what they want them to hear.

The most revolting aspect of the commune system in China is revealed by the treatment now given to the older people:

All the elderly people 60 years of age and above who cannot work are put in the old people's "Happy Home." After they are placed in the homes they are given shots. They are told these shots are for their health. But after the shots are taken, they die within two weeks. After they die, the corpses are placed in vats. When the bodies decay and maggots set in, the maggots are used to feed chickens. The remainder of the body is used for fertilizer. Old graves are also dug up and the bones used for fertilizer.

Soldiers of the Red Army, according to Rev. Wang, are not satisfied. They do not like the breakdown of the family unit, have a tendency to look the other way when refugees try to escape and, when their officers' eyes are not on them, do not force the people to work hard—even standing by and doing nothing when others sabotage the system. Rev. Wang continued:

During the bombardment of Quemoy, many of the shells that came over were duds and on the shells were carved "Return back to the mainland," or "Go back to the mainland" for the Chinese on Formosa. The symbol used on the shells is in common use in China.

Rev. Tsin-tsai Liu, pastor of the Gospel Baptist Church in Taipei, said that the Communists were friendly when they first took over China in 1949, but began wholesale persecutions of Protestant churches in 1950. Christian leaders were placed under house arrest. Christians were blacklisted and could not hold government jobs. In addition, they had to be "reeducated" and attend confession classes to reveal their past associations and beliefs.

After the Christian ministers and leaders were arrested, they were replaced with Communists. The government now uses Chin Ling

Theological Seminary in Nanking and the Shanghai China Theological Seminary in Shanghai to train their own "preachers." Prior to the Communist takeover, there were over twenty-five Protestant seminaries in China. Today there are only five, all of which are controlled by the Communists.

The Communists confiscated the churches and then rented them back to the people at "fantastic" rentals. When the people could not pay these rentals, the churches were closed:

The only churches that were allowed to remain open were Communist-run churches that serve as show cases for visitors.

Rev. Liu does not believe that these churches will ever be closed by the Communists because "they are a good means of spreading propaganda and reeducating the people. Also the churches give them an appearance of a dignified civilization."

Rev. Liu revealed that after the Communist takeover, a considerable number of teachers in the seminaries who had been considered leftists and had called themselves "progressives" revealed their true colors and emerged as full-fledged collaborators with the Communists.

Rev. Samuel W. S. Cheng, who received theological training at Princeton Theological Seminary and is superintendent of the Gospelaires Friends Mission in Taipei, stated that since 1949 the Communist government of China had confiscated over 20 million U.S. dollars in church property; about 140,000 mainland Christians have been killed by the Communists; 5 million Chinese have fled as refugees to Hong Kong, Formosa, and other parts of the world; and over 30 million Chinese have been killed or persecuted.

The Communist government, he said, confiscates all relief goods sent to the mainland. None of it gets to the people. The only effective relief is air drop, such as that done by the Chinese Nationalists at night so the relief goods can be picked up secretly. All other relief is wasted.

Rev. Cheng described what had happened to the family of a member of the Chinese Nationalist House of Representatives on Formosa. Because he was intensely anti-Communist, 180 members of his family—including brothers, cousins, etc.—had been killed. He told what had happened to the man's sister-in-law, "a very good woman," in the following words:

The Communists thought she had a whole lot of money and asked a lot of her, and she said she had lent it. So it made the Communists very mad at her. They used five horses. One horse was tied to her neck and the other horses were tied to her arms and legs and they went in all directions. The biggest horse ran and it just tore her body into pieces. The blood streamed all over the public square, and the people shut their eyes and cried. They could not stand to see it.

Kyung Rai Kim, Christian leader in Southern Korea and chief of the religious section of the Kook Do Daily News in Seoul, told of Northern Korean Communist persecution of religion. As in China,

he said, all denominations have been eliminated in Northern Korea. There is only one so-called church, the "Northern Church Association" and it, too, is not a true Christian church but merely a propaganda tool of the government.

Over 95 percent of the Christians of Northern Korea, he said, have fled to Southern Korea. Before 1945, there were 1,500 Protestant churches in Northern Korea. Today there are only 116 church buildings and most of them are used as public halls. Prior to 1945, there were 3 Protestant theological seminaries, 20 Bible schools, and 12 mission schools in Northern Korea. Today there are none. During the Korean War, the Northern Korean Communists killed 1,650 ministers and shot 1,600,000 Northern Korean people, including 125,000 Christians.

Mr. Kim also disclosed how the Northern Korean Communist government went about destroying the church in that country.

An "educational" ministry was set up in Pyongyang in 1946 to eliminate the Christian churches. This ministry sent secret police agents to the churches to listen to the ministers' sermons. Those who preached the Christian gospel were accused of being opposed to the government and were, therefore, arrested. Initially, the government tried to force them to confess their guilt. Later, they were shot or otherwise killed:

The government made public examples of the ministers by torturing them. An evangelist friend of mine, Lee Chang Whan, was killed. He was 26 years old, a real intellectual, a graduate of a Lutheran seminary, and could speak six languages fluently. In the winter of 1948, he was killed by the Communists, because he was going to print the Bible. He was trying to publish the Bible in secret because there was no freedom for Bible publishing under the puppet regime. The Red police stripped him naked, bound him, and put him into an empty water pool. It was 17 degrees below zero that day. They filled the pool solid. My friend froze to death in 30 minutes. Then the police exhibited his body to the people.

In January 1951, 250 pastors were killed by the Communists on the same day in the same place in Hong Jai Dong, Seoul, Korea. The Red police made holes through the pastors' hands with an ax and bound them hand to hand with an iron thread, and they shot them. In February 1951, at Won Dang Church, Chen Ra Nam Do Province, Red soldiers burned 83 Christians with gasoline.

Mr. Kim further testified that the people of Southern Korea believe there is danger of another attack from the north because the Communist regime is sending so many spies to Southern Korea. A former Communist spy who had defected, he said, revealed that the Northern Korean government was sending 200 spies per month to Southern Korea. Mr. Kim also said that since 1945 the Southern Korean national police had arrested over 47,000 Northern agents and spies and confiscated 1,500,000 American dollars from them.

CONTROL OF THE ARTS IN THE COMMUNIST EMPIRE

IVAN P. BAHRIANY

June 3, 1959

Khrushchev's control over all cultural activity in the Communist empire is as rigid as was Stalin's, but Khrushchev is more subtle, Ivan Bahriany stated.³

Mr. Bahriany's own life illustrates how Stalin controlled the arts in his Red domain and, indirectly, how Khrushchev exercises similar influence today.

After completing his studies at the Kiev Art Institute in 1929, Bahriany was denied a degree because his father was of the wrong class and considered an enemy of the state. Bahriany joined a group of writers known as MARS, the "Workshop of the Revolutionary Word." He was critical of the Soviet regime in his writings, which were published in Soviet-Ukrainian magazines. For this reason, he was attacked by official Communist publications. The October 1931 issue of *Krytyka*, for example, denounced him as a traitor and enemy of the state. He was arrested by the GPU in 1932 and, after being held in solitary confinement for 11 months, was tried secretly and sentenced to 5 years at hard labor as a counterrevolutionary and enemy of the regime. His 5-year sentence was the minimum term—granted because of his youth.

He was sent to a camp of the Bamalag system on the Baikal-Amur railroad line where he worked as a common laborer, cutting lumber and laying track. Approximately four million prisoners were working on this railroad line at the time. The majority of them were political prisoners, rather than ordinary criminals. There were many writers, professors, lawyers, and teachers among them, as well as peasants and workers. Because of the extreme rigor of the Soviet prison system at the time, several thousand prisoners were dying daily when Bahriany was in a camp in Komsomolsk.

Political prisoners received rougher treatment than ordinary criminals. Bahriany gave the reasons for this:

The Soviet regime considers that ordinary criminals, when they commit a crime, damage or do harm to a single person or an individual, whereas poets, writers, literary figures, when they are anti-Soviet, naturally damage the entire Soviet system, the foundation on which it stands, because through the literature they spread different kinds of ideology, different kinds of beliefs, than those in which the Communists believe.

³ See "Control of the Arts in the Communist Empire," Consultation with Ivan P. Bahriany, Committee on Un-American Activities, June 3, 1959.

Mr. Bahriany, novelist, poet and painter, and currently a resident of Ulm, West Germany, is president of the Ukrainian National Rada, a coalition of Ukrainian democratic parties in exile, with headquarters in Munich.

Born in Poltava province in the Ukraine in 1907, Mr. Bahriany attended an art and ceramic school and then completed a course at the Kiev Art Institute in 1929. As a writer, he was critical of the Communist regime and was, therefore, arrested by the GPU in 1932 and sentenced to a slave labor camp. During World War II, he fought with the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) against both the Nazis and the Communists. Escaping to the West when war ended, he became chairman of the Ukrainian Relief Committee in Innsbruck and, at the height of the Soviet repatriation drive, wrote a pamphlet entitled "Why I Don't Want to Go Home," which was translated into English, German, Italian, and Spanish.

Mr. Bahriany is presently editor of the Ukrainian paper "We Will Return Again" (to a free Ukraine). His book "The Hunters and the Hunted," based on his experiences in hunting wild animals in Siberia after his escape from a slave labor camp there, has been translated and published in the United States.

Criminals or murderers are punished very severely for their crimes when their crimes are directed against Communist Party officials, but not if they are directed against ordinary citizens.

Bahriany escaped from the slave labor camp at the end of 1936 and lived in the Soviet Far East between Vladivostok and Khabarovsk among common people who sympathized with, and were willing to help, labor camp escapees.

In 1938, using fictitious documents which he had bought, he returned to the Ukraine to visit his mother and was caught by the NKVD. He was again accused of treason and fomenting rebellion and tortured for refusing to confess. He spent 83 days in a death cell, but was returned to an ordinary prison in 1939 when Stalin, in an effort to gain popularity with the people, commuted death sentences, saying that enemies of the state had penetrated the NKVD and many innocent people had, therefore, been arrested. Six months later—and 2 years and 7 months after his second arrest—Bahriany was released under police surveillance in his native town of Kuzmin.

During the German occupation, he worked in the Ukrainian theater. In 1944, he joined and fought with the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and, at the time of the German retreat, made his way to West Germany through Austria and Yugoslavia with thousands of other Ukrainian refugees.

Immediately after World War II, when the Soviet Union was attempting to forcibly repatriate many thousands of people who had escaped from its borders, an attempt was made to arrest him in Austria. He, therefore, went to Bavaria. It was during this period that he served as chairman of the Ukrainian Relief Committee in Innsbruck, tried to persuade allied officials not to turn Ukrainian escapees over to the Soviets, and wrote his pamphlet "Why I Don't Want to Go Home."

Prior to his arrest in 1932, Bahriany knew 250 top Ukrainian intellectuals—poets, writers, professors. In 1938, when he returned to the Ukraine, only 33 of them were left. All the others had been deported, imprisoned, or executed because they were considered dangerous, or had committed suicide. This is one example of how the Soviet state controlled the arts under Stalin. In the 1920's, according to Bahriany, few of the top intellectuals and prominent writers in the Ukraine were Communist Party members. It was not until Stalin introduced his campaign of terror to eliminate all those in the cultural field who refused to toe the party line that many became party members to save their lives.

There has been no change in conditions for intellectuals under Khrushchev's rule. Bahriany can no more return to the Ukraine and write freely today than he could prior to Stalin's death. As recently as March 1959, he was attacked in *The Literary Gazette*, the official organ of the Union of Writers of Ukraine, and branded as a traitor. He had received letters from Soviet officials promising him a pardon if he would return. When he said he would not, he then received threats.

Under Khrushchev's rule, Bahriany's son, who was 6 years old when he last saw him and is now 23 years of age, has been used to make radio appeals for him to return to the Ukraine. Because

Bahriany has not done so, his son has called him a traitor to his country and a man who has sold out to the "imperialists."

Khrushchev's "rehabilitation" of writers in the Communist empire, which was publicized at the time of the Congress of the Union of Soviet Writers in Moscow last May, is, according to Mr. Bahriany, actually a technique Khrushchev is using to compel present-day writers to conform strictly to the Communist Party line—just as they had to in Stalin's day. There are two phases to this rehabilitation campaign, Mr. Bahriany pointed out. On the one hand, writers who were liquidated by Stalin years ago are now receiving the official endorsement of the Khrushchev regime. This is being done to still the questioning of the young people in the Communist empire as to why the Communists have liquidated so many literary figures. Khrushchev says that these men were actually not guilty as was charged in the past; that their works were misrepresented and they were wrongly executed. For this reason, their writings are being republished.

Mr. Bahriany pointed out, however, that the republished works of the "rehabilitated" writers have been carefully edited and changed so that they conform completely to the Communist line and all criticism of communism and the Soviet state has been eliminated from them.

Mr. Bahriany cited the case of Boris Pasternak, author of "Doctor Zhivago," to illustrate that the so-called "rehabilitation" of living writers is no more than a device for controlling them. A number of writers who have been expelled from the Soviet Writers Union in the past for deviating from the party line and for criticizing the regime were taken back into the fold at the meeting of the Congress in May, 1959. Pasternak was not, however—because he is the only true anti-Communist among the dissidents and because he has refused to confess error. For this reason, he is still an outcast, denied any official standing in the Soviet Union and any outlet for his works. The treatment given Pasternak, Bahriany stated, is designed to serve as an example to all Soviet writers—they must conform or they will be denied any opportunity to write.⁴

There is a simple explanation, Bahriany said, for the Soviet Union's refusal to let Pasternak accept the Nobel Prize, even though it permitted three Soviet scientists to accept one. The Soviet Union gained by the awarding of the prize to the scientists. It had important prestige values and helped to create the impression throughout the world that the Soviet Government is a sponsor, protector, and producer of great scientific achievement (despite its anti-scientific attitude, as exemplified in the Lysenko case).

Pasternak's book, "Doctor Zhivago," however, was anti-Communist and an indictment of the regime. For this reason, the Soviet Union could not permit him to accept the prize. To do so would be to honor an enemy and to imply acceptance of the evils Pasternak pointed out in communism.

On the subject of cultural exchanges, Mr. Bahriany said that these had "many dangerous features" which the United States and the West do not realize. Through these exchanges, the Soviet Union succeeds in portraying in the United States things which do not exist in the U.S.S.R. By presenting false pictures of the Communist sys-

⁴ Events have confirmed Bahriany's prediction. As of the end of this year, Pasternak was still ostracized and the subject of vicious attacks in the Soviet press.

tem in the Soviet Union, the exchanges mislead and misinform, rather than promote true knowledge of communism. There is no cultural freedom in the Soviet Union—but they create the impression that there is. The exchanges also serve as a camouflage for Soviet suppression of the national cultures of the peoples forcibly incorporated in the Red empire, such as the Armenians, Byelorussians, and the Balts.

Through the Russification program being carried out among these people, Bahriany said, the Soviet Union is actually engaged in a kind of “spiritual genocide.” Because the exchanges help to conceal this and the oppression, persecutions, and brutality so widespread in the Communist empire, they “enhance the spread of Communist tendencies” and are “very detrimental” to the United States.

Mr. Bahriany was asked what he thought of the inclusion of the works of identified Communists and fellow travelers in the art section of the American National Exhibition in Moscow, a matter which was later the subject of a hearing by this committee. He classified it as “a great disservice” to the American people and to the cause of peace. The Soviet mentality, he pointed out, is different from the American. After more than 40 years of Communist rule, they do not appreciate the freedom to criticize, and the inclusion of “social protest” art in an American exhibition would tend to give the impression that the elite of this country is against the Government and that the Communist Party and the Communist elite in the United States are very strong.

Propagandawise, he said, Moscow would exploit the idea that many of America’s top artists are Communist and Soviet sympathizers and that their works confirm various Communist charges concerning the United States. After what had happened in Hungary, Poland, and Tibet, Mr. Bahriany said, it is “criminal” to add to Soviet prestige in this fashion.

THE CRIMES OF KHRUSHCHEV

Part 1

EUGENE LYONS

September 4, 1959

Khrushchev rose to the Number One post in the Soviet empire on a mountain of human corpses. The peaceful intentions he professes toward the West are no more worthy of belief than those of Stalin or Hitler, Eugene Lyons told the committee in the first of a series of consultations on the criminal career of the Soviet Premier.⁵

Nikita Khrushchev was born of a peasant-worker family in Kalinovka, in Kursk province, Mr. Lyons said. He had practically no schooling and, as a youth, worked as a shepherd and in mines and

⁵ See “The Crimes of Khrushchev” Part 1, Consultation with Mr. Eugene Lyons, Committee on Un-American Activities, September 4, 1959.

Mr. Lyons, a senior editor of *The Reader’s Digest*, has long been recognized as an authority on communism and the Soviet Union. He is the author of “Moscow Carrousel,” “Assignment in Utopia,” “Stalin: Czar of All the Russias,” “The Red Decade,” and “Our Secret Allies: The Peoples of Russia,” and of hundreds of articles including two biographical features on Khrushchev published in *The Reader’s Digest* during the last 2 years. After attending the City College of New York and Columbia University Eugene Lyons was for a time caught up in the radical movement and, though he never joined the Communist Party, in his own words, “got pretty close to it.” In the mid-20’s, he worked for the New York bureau of Tass, the Soviet news agency. He subsequently spent 6 years in Moscow as United Press correspondent there. This cured him of any pro-Soviet or Communist sentiments. During World War II, he edited the *American Mercury* magazine and subsequently launched and edited *Pageant*. He has been associated with *The Reader’s Digest* since 1946.

factories. In his early days, he was completely nonpolitical. It was not until 1918, when he was 24, that he joined the Communist Party and took part in the Russian civil war. His conversion to communism was not ideological or the result of careful thought and study; rather, it was a quick, emotional decision. According to Mr. Lyons: "His communism has remained primitive and unsophisticated ever since."

When the civil war ended in Russia, Khrushchev obtained a job in a factory and enrolled in a workers' school, from which he graduated with the equivalent of an elementary education. He served as party secretary in the school, held the same post in several districts, and finally in Kiev, capital of the Ukraine. There he became a protege of Lazar Kaganovich, the Kremlin boss of the Ukraine, and began to move ahead rapidly in the party.

Khrushchev in 1929 went to Moscow where he attended a technical school for 3 years. In 1932 he became chief assistant to Kaganovich, then secretary of the Moscow province. In 1934, he succeeded Kaganovich as Moscow city and Moscow province secretary. Kaganovich became commissar of railroads. During the same year, Khrushchev became a member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

He was sent to the Ukraine again in January 1938, as Stalin's killer. The first thing he did upon arriving there was to call a "social" gathering of the entire Ukrainian Government. In the midst of the affair, he had the secret police surround the building and arrest everyone in it. Most of them were liquidated:

When his two-year Ukrainian purge was over, an estimated 400,000 had been killed and terror gripped the whole population. Khrushchev had been made secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party, but in the popular mind he won a more enduring title, the Hangman of the Ukraine.

Khrushchev continued to climb the party ladder. In 1938, he became an alternate member of the Politburo, and in 1939 a full member.

Khrushchev was a strong and outspoken supporter of Stalin's purges. After one of the major trials had ended, he said of its victims:

By lifting their hand against Comrade Stalin, they lifted it against the best humanity possesses. For Stalin is our hope. He is the beacon which guides all progressive mankind. Stalin is our banner! Stalin is our will! Stalin is our victory!

During World War II, the Ukraine was occupied by the Germans. Khrushchev left to serve on other Soviet fronts in 1941-42 and returned to the Ukraine in 1943, when the Germans retreated. Khrushchev immediately proceeded to punish the Ukrainian people for having welcomed the Germans as liberators. He instituted new purges:

* * * This second or post-war purge, again under Khrushchev's command, was if anything more bloody and more horrifying than the first. Those liquidated, by exile or death, ran into hundreds of thousands.

In 1949, Khrushchev returned to Moscow and again assumed the post of secretary of the province. When Stalin died in 1953, Khrushchev became a member of the so-called "collective leadership" which succeeded him. After Beria, who headed the secret police, was liquidated, Khrushchev assumed Stalin's post as first secretary of the party.

Khrushchev, as the Number One man in the Soviet Communist Party, had complete responsibility, and must take full blame, for the 1956 blood bath in Hungary, Mr. Lyons stated. When the U.S. Ambassador asked Khrushchev what he would do to stop the flow of blood in that land, Khrushchev replied:

We will put in more troops and more troops and more troops until we have finished them.

It was an order of Khrushchev that entrapped General Maleter, the leader of the Hungarian freedom fighters, into a phony conference—and then had him killed. Then it was an order of Khrushchev that lured Imre Nagy out of asylum in the Yugoslav Embassy—to his eventual death.

During the following year, Khrushchev eliminated the threat to his supremacy in the Kremlin posed by the old-time, top-ranking Communist leaders. He put Malenkov, Molotov, and his old friend, Kaganovich, out of the running with General Zhukov's help. A year later, he saw to it that Zhukov was eliminated from the picture.

Although Khrushchev is externally different from Stalin—an extrovert rather than an introvert—he is as great a menace. Mr. Lyons said:

* * * Under the ebullient surface he is every bit as blood-thirsty and dictatorial as his dead master. Stalin, too, didn't begin to kill his closest associates until he had been in absolute power for seven or eight years. Should the need to kill arise, Khrushchev's hand, to use his own phrase in the matter, "will not tremble."

* * * Khrushchev has a genius for intrigue, betrayal, and mass homicide as large as Stalin's. He is a fanatic Communist, with a tightly closed mind on anything affecting Communist doctrine.

Khrushchev is only half-educated, an anti-intellectual and not a thinker, but he has—

a peasant-like shrewdness, a quick and sharp wit and is, in my opinion, more than a match for our Western statesmen in the give-and-take of argument or negotiation.

* * * * *

He is a dedicated, know-nothing, fanatic Communist. He has no doubt that he and his cause are riding the wave of the future, that capitalism and all other non-Soviet ways of life are doomed to defeat and extinction.

On the question of peaceful coexistence, Mr. Lyons said:

* * * no more cynical phrase has ever been coined. To us it means a true cessation of hostilities. To them it means a convenient method of disarming us psychologically * * *.

Mr. Lyons emphasized the duality of Khrushchev's position—a fact which many people do not stop to think about and which makes it easier for him to hoodwink the non-Communist world. Khrushchev, he said, is the leader of both a conventional government and a world revolutionary movement. What he or any other Kremlin leader does as the head of this government is not binding on the world Communist movement. For this reason, every agreement with him is “a snare and a delusion,” even if it is kept in a technical sense by the Soviet Government itself.

Mr. Lyons also pointed out that even if he wished to do so, Khrushchev could not call off the activities of the world Communist organization:

World communism, with its open and underground Communist Parties, its network of false-front organizations, its infiltrated unions and governments, its para-military formations in many countries—the whole colossal machine of power—is too vast and too dynamic to be stopped in mid-course.

Even though Khrushchev's talk of peaceful coexistence is not sincere, Mr. Lyons said, this does not mean that he wants a nuclear showdown with the United States:

He's not mad. He is supremely confident of achieving his purposes by other means. But he continually rattles his missiles, exploiting our pacifism, our fears, our loss of nerve. The Kremlin, let us never forget, won its greatest victories without war, at a time when the free nations had overwhelming military superiority and a monopoly of nuclear power. Their real advantages are not military but political and psychological.

On the subject of Khrushchev's visit to the United States, Mr. Lyons said:

The mere invitation amounts to a terrific victory for communism. It amounts to an acknowledgment by the world's leading democracy of the Kremlin's power and permanence. Therefore it adds dimensions of prestige to every Communist group in every country.

Being master propagandists, the Communists understand the value of symbols. That invitation will be taken by Communists, their fellow-travelers, their victims, as a symbol of our weakness. More, of our capitulation to Moscow threats.

For years Khrushchev has maneuvered for just such an invitation. There were times when he would have paid a high price for it. Now we have given it to him gratis, because he has an ultimatum-gun pointed at our heads in Berlin. Even for that 1955 summit meeting, Moscow paid a price: the withdrawal from Austria. This time it is so cocky that, far from restraining its hordes, it allowed them to undertake aggressions even while the invitation was being negotiated and before Khrushchev came to our country.

Mr. Lyons added that the effect of Khrushchev's visit on the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain would be a "body blow" to their morale and that it would go far toward undermining their faith in the United States because it was so clearly contradictory of many of our statements about communism and the captive nations:

A future historian will face a strange paradox when he comes to the year 1959: in July, he will note, our Congress and President called upon the American people to pray for the captive nations; in September those people were called upon to do honor to the head of the mob that holds those nations in captivity!

Despite their claims to the contrary, the Communists do not want to reduce tensions, Mr. Lyons asserted. They have actually created the tensions which now exist—and need them. What the United States actually needs, he added, is a greater awareness of these tensions and their true significance so that it will deal with them courageously. The idea of reduced tensions could be a fatal illusion for the free world.

Most people do not realize how late it is in the Communist timetable for world domination, Mr. Lyons said. He pointed out that the Kremlin does not have to take over the world physically in order to control and exploit it. It must merely isolate the United States, its main opponent, to the point where it must take orders from Moscow "or else." The Communists prefer to take over our industrial complex intact rather than as a "heap of nuclear rubble."

Mr. Lyons made the following suggestion for changing the course of the cold war:

There must be a complete revision of American thinking on this subject and a readiness for "sacrifice and risk." It is only when we grasp the important truth that the struggle with communism is not subject to compromise that we will begin to develop a strategy of our own for victory.

Mr. Lyons struck an optimistic note when he pointed out as one of the encouraging elements in the general picture, his belief that the American people themselves do recognize the nature of the Communist threat. They seem to understand the Communist challenge more clearly, with less self-delusion, than those in positions of power in our own country and other free nations.

He expressed the conviction that the people will follow leaders with the courage and clearheadedness needed to deal with the Communist challenge if such leaders are found.

Expressing his viewpoint about the reports on conditions in Russia brought back by American tourists, Mr. Lyons said:

Skepticism is a mild word for how I feel about it. Now and then, of course, the tourist does bring back some fragments of truth, especially in relation to his own field of competence. But these morsels are few and far between. Besides, the home folks can hardly be expected to separate the rare grains of truth from the mountain of chaff.

THE CRIMES OF KHRUSHCHEV

Part 2

DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY	MR. CONSTANTIN KONONENKO
MR. PETRO PAVLOVYCH	MR. MYKOLA LEBED
PROF. DR. IVAN M. MALININ	DR. GREGORY KOSTIUK
MR. NICHOLAS PRYCHODKO	PROF. IVAN WOWCHUK
MR. JURIJ LAWRYNENKO	

September 9-11, 1959

Cold-blooded murders committed by Khrushchev, principally during his tenure as the Communist political executioner in the Ukraine, were detailed by nine witnesses.⁶

Dr. Lev Dobriansky, professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University and national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, stated that "the record of Khrushchev's crimes is really the basis for his whole political growth and ascension in the Soviet Union," and that the Soviet premier is "the greatest and most infamous genocidist alive today."

Dr. Dobriansky summarized the wholesale killings and atrocities carried out by Khrushchev which earned for him the title "Hangman of the Ukraine."

During the late 1930's some 400,000 people were murdered while he ruled that area for Moscow; 9,500 people, as one example, were massacred in the town of Vinnitsa.

During World War II, Khrushchev used his Communist partisans in the Ukraine to provoke the Nazis into persecuting the civilian population.

In 1944-46, Khrushchev was responsible for the liquidation of the Ukrainian Catholic Church and the suppression of the Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalic Church.

After World War II, Khrushchev proceeded to do everything in his power to liquidate the Ukrainian Insurgent Army which had fought against both the Nazis and the Communists. He sought to undermine this group by crimes committed against its members' families.

In 1954-55, through his "virgin land" policy, he forcibly resettled many thousands of Ukrainian youth in Kazakhstan.

During the same year, he barbarously suppressed striking Ukrainian political prisoners at Vorkuta, Mordovia, and Karaganda.

In 1954, he decimated 500 Ukrainian women who were protesting conditions in the Kingir slave labor camp.

The distinction between Stalin and Khrushchev, Dr. Dobriansky said, is that Khrushchev's "is a more or less silk-glove terrorism whereas Stalin's was a raw-knuckle terrorism." Substantially, however, "the tyrannical rule has not changed" in the Soviet empire under Khrushchev, just as the long-range objectives of communism have not changed.

Dr. Dobriansky said that Khrushchev's visit to the United States was "a cold-war victory for Moscow" and outlined some of the dangers that it posed to this country.

⁶ See "The Crimes of Khrushchev," Part 2, Consultations with Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Mr. Petro Pavlovych, Prof. Dr. Ivan M. Malinin, Mr. Nicholas Prychodko, Mr. Constantin Kononenko, Mr. Mykola Lebed, Dr. Gregory Kostiuik, Prof. Ivan Wowchuk, and Mr. Jurij Lawrynenko, September 9-11, 1959.

He declared that some statements made by prominent Americans who had visited the Soviet Union, to the effect that slave labor camps had been abolished there, are completely false.

Apollon Trembow, whose nom de plume is Petro Pavlovych, gave a first-hand account of the Vinnitsa massacre. He had been a member of the Ukrainian Commission To Investigate the Vinnitsa Killings. On May 24, 1943, he and ten other members of the Commission—doctors, professors, editors, and bishops—opened the first graves of the 1937–38 massacre that had taken place in that town. He stated that in the course of the next 4 months a total of 39 graves were opened on Pidlisna Street and 5,644 bodies found in them. In the Orthodox Cemetery 42 graves were opened and 2,405 bodies uncovered. In the Park of Culture and Recreation, built over the old Roman Catholic cemetery, 14 mass graves were opened and found to contain 1,390 bodies. In all 9,439 bodies were discovered in 95 mass graves.

Mr. Trembow submitted photographs of the bodies and mass graves found by the Commission. Some of these he had taken himself. He appeared in others. The photographs were made a part of the record.

At the time these mass killings were carried out in Vinnitsa, Khrushchev was first secretary to the Ukrainian Communist Party. The NKVD, which carried out the atrocities, was under his command.

Khrushchev's culpability for these massacres was verified by the testimony of Professor Dr. Ivan M. Malinin, a Ukrainian pathologist who arrived in Vinnitsa in 1943 after having escaped from a Soviet prison and who was made a member of the medical commission which examined the bodies uncovered in the mass graves. He personally performed autopsies on some 1,000 of these bodies and testified that medical findings revealed that the bodies had been buried from 3 to 5 years; that, in other words, the killings had taken place during Khrushchev's rule in the Ukraine. Most of the victims, he said, had been killed by a pistol shot in the base of the brain. Some had been buried alive. Not only Ukrainians, but Russians, Poles, and Jews, were among the liquidated.

He, too, introduced photographs of the killings and made this statement:

* * * these photographs cannot begin to portray the screams, the stench in the air, and the emotion which permeated the air as the relatives of these innocent victims went from body to body undertaking to identify their loved ones.

* * * the events that occurred at Vinnitsa stagger the imagination with their revolting inhumanity. The Vinnitsa massacres occurred only in one area at one time. But they were repeated ad nauseum throughout Ukraine during Khrushchev's regime.

Nicholas Prychodko, an engineer, who lived in the Ukraine until 1944, described what happened in January 1938, when Khrushchev arrived to take over command of that area:

At that time, I remember being in Kiev and Khrushchev arrived with a very big score of NKVD men from Moscow. They called a special meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. At that meeting they were sur-

rounded by the people Khrushchev brought from Moscow and there was an interruption of that meeting at noontime. For example, the head of the Ukrainian People's Commissariat asked to go home; he shot his wife, himself, and tried to shoot his son.

There was a tremendous purge all over Ukraine which followed the arrival of Khrushchev.

Mr. Prychodko was himself arrested and imprisoned by the NKVD. During his imprisonment, secret police "investigators" spit in his mouth, beat him with the leg of a chair and with a plank from which about 20 small blunted nails protruded. There were about 3,000 slave laborers, he said, in the camp where he was held in Ivdel, about 600 miles northeast of Sverdlov. Conditions were so harsh that approximately 15 of these people died each day. He, himself, was on the verge of death when released from the camp.

Mykola Lebed, who fought in the Ukraine underground movement from 1927 until he escaped from his native land in 1944, testified on the manner in which Khrushchev tried to eliminate the Ukraine Insurgent Army when he returned to the Ukraine in 1943 after the German retreat. When he failed in this undertaking, he took reprisals on the civilian population.

Mr. Lebed listed some of the things Khrushchev did in the hope of so terrorizing the members of the resistance movement and their families that they would give up their fight against Communist rule of their homeland. He named the seven districts in which these methods were used, not only within the prisons but also in public places, with the people forced to witness what went on:

With hot irons they tortured those prisoners who were caught.

They cut into the skin and tore the skin off from the living body.

They also nailed people on the cross.

They cut off the sexual organs, and breasts of women.

They cut out eyes, broke bones in legs and arms and extracted nails.

The NKVD under Lt. Gen. Riasnyv, a subordinate of Khrushchev, carried out these atrocities and also adopted other techniques to terrorize the population and depress their will to resist. They poisoned medical capsules, public water supplies, cigarettes, and chocolates.

Mr. Lebed also told of the manner in which Khrushchev persecuted religion in the Ukraine. On April 4, 1945, he had 600 NKVD troops surround the residence of Metropolitan Josef Slipyi of the Ukrainian Catholic Church. All of the church's eight bishops were arrested at the same time. Seven of them have since died in concentration camps. Only one is alive today. Metropolitan Slipyi was sentenced to 8 years in a concentration camp in 1945 and, in 1959, to another 7 years. He is now 67 years old.

There were previously 4,400 Catholic churches and 127 monasteries in the Ukraine. Today there is none. The Ukrainian Orthodox Church has also been eliminated.

Mr. Lebed named places where concentration camps are presently located in the Soviet empire. Khrushchev, he said, had fooled some people in the free world by transferring political prisoners from places where it was known that slave labor camps existed to new areas about which the West was not informed.

Dr. Gregory Kostiuk, a professor who lived in the Ukraine until the early 1940's, testified that Khrushchev, himself, was responsible for the murder of many of the former Ukrainian writers and officials that he is now rehabilitating. Khrushchev, he pointed out, had publicly supported the purges in which these men were eliminated. He quoted from Pravda, issue of June 7, 1937, a statement made by Khrushchev when he was secretary of the Moscow district:

to annihilate all Trotskyites, Zinovievites, enemies of the people, to the last kin, so that there will remain not even a memory behind them and to scatter them to the winds.

Dr. Kostiuk also stated that because the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine had opposed the candidacy of Khrushchev for general secretary, there was, in the beginning of 1938 when Khrushchev assumed that post, "not even one member of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party who was not annihilated or arrested."

Out of the 62 persons who were members of the Central Committee and the 40 who were candidates to the party, only three were unaffected by Khrushchev's purge, and not one of the 17 members of the prior Lubchenko government was left. Premier Lubchenko committed suicide and also killed his wife. As a result, at the time Khrushchev became general secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party on January 29, 1938, the Central Committee was nonexistent—all its members had been eliminated or imprisoned.

Professor Ivan Wowchuk, a resident of the Ukraine until 1943, presented information he had obtained on Khrushchev's criminal activities affecting the Ukraine during and since World War II.

As the Red Army retreated in 1941, he said, Khrushchev demolished the treasures of Kharkov, Kiev, and other cities. The general policy he has followed since then has been to exterminate Ukrainian nationalism and culture.

In 1945-46, he organized a small man-made famine in the Ukraine.

In 1950, he centralized the collective farms, cutting their number from 240,000 to 96,000 in 1952 so that the Kremlin would be better able to control the people.

In 1953, he promulgated a law making whole families responsible for the father's agricultural production.

In 1954, through his virgin lands development, he deported thousands of Ukrainian rebels and built up a Soviet agricultural base with their labor.

In 1959, he has held public trials of Ukrainian freedom fighters, forcing public attendance at them.

He also promulgated a law to eliminate the teaching of the Ukrainian language in the schools.

Jurij Lawrynenko, another former Ukrainian citizen who was three times arrested while living in the Ukraine, stated that "under the

mask of de-Stalinization Khrushchev is actually continuing Stalin's genocide, both political and cultural."

The Russian language, he said, is being forced on the Ukrainian people. Although Ukrainians make up 21 percent of the population of the U.S.S.R., only 3 percent of the journals are in the Ukrainian language. On the other hand, although the Russian population makes up only 50 percent of the U.S.S.R. total, 92 percent of all the journals are published in the Russian language. Full, objective history of the Ukraine cannot be taught. 80 percent of the Ukraine's intellectuals were purged in the 1930's.

Khrushchev has utter contempt for intellectuals, Mr. Lawrynenko stated, and, on one occasion, said they should be killed off like flies.

He stated that through the cultural exchange programs, Khrushchev is palming off on the West the cultural achievements of the Ukraine and other enslaved areas as "Communist" and "Russian" accomplishments. He cited this incident as an example:

A U.S. official was impressed when he saw the Ukrainian national dance ensemble in Kiev and tried to arrange a visit to the United States. Moscow refused and instead added some of the Ukrainian group's numbers to the repertoire of the Soviet Moiseyev dance group which later came to this country.

He also cited the case of Dovzhenko, an internationally known theatrical and film figure—and a Ukrainian—to demonstrate how Khrushchev suppresses the national cultures of his enslaved peoples. Stalin called Dovzhenko to Moscow in 1933 and said that he would not be liquidated if he would work for Russia. For 20 years, Dovzhenko was barred from returning to the Ukraine and doing any work there. After Stalin's death in 1953, he was allowed to go back to the Ukraine, where he left his notes. They included the following statements:

Who separated me for 20 years from my people, my Ukraine? It is impossible to create something, being separated from life, your people. And now I am back. I hope I will create my best moving picture. It will be the greatest picture, I hope * * * and nobody will again be able to separate me from my people.

But Dovzhenko was forcibly sent back to Moscow in 1956 and shortly thereafter died of a "heart attack."

THE CRIMES OF KHRUSHCHEV

Part 3

GENERAL BELA KIRALY
MR. JOSEPH KOVAGO

September 10, 1959

Eyewitness accounts of Khrushchev's bloody and brutal suppression of the Hungarian patriots, his diplomatic treachery during the Hungarian revolution, and Hungary's present status as a nationwide

prison controlled by Khrushchev's army units were recounted by General Bela Kiraly and Joseph Kovago.⁷

General Bela Kiraly described the purposes of the Hungarian revolution as follows:

The first basic aim of it was to abolish the Communist one-party dictatorship, the Communist social and economic order, and to establish a new democratic and economic system, parliamentary government, based on a general secret election.

The second basic aim of the Hungarian revolution was to get rid of the Soviet colonial rule and to establish the nation's independence.

General Kiraly stated that following World War II, the Communist Party in Hungary "consisted of a handful of people who came back from the Soviet Union as Soviet citizens." By 1956, however, the number had increased to nearly one million, or ten percent of the population.

General Kiraly accounted for this growth in membership by stating that it was due partially to opportunism—the need for Communist support to get good jobs. A second factor was that the Communist Party needed large numbers to show itself as the strongest party. It, therefore, not only gave concessions to its members (even accepting Fascists) but pressed people to join solely for this purpose.

The third reason, the General added, was that many people joined the Communist Party because of fear, "because to be a party member did mean, in some respects, a defense against the atrocities of the secret police and other terror organizations."

The 1956 Hungarian revolution began as a spontaneous nationwide reform movement, developing finally, on October 23, 1956, into a huge demonstration in Budapest, the people announcing their strong will to repel, through peaceful means, the Communist dictatorship. General Kiraly stated:

On that day the Communist Party leadership in Budapest found out that the Communist Party had only two alternatives: Either to let this reform movement progress further

* * * or * * * to use the forces which were at the disposal of the Communist Party to suppress this reform movement

⁷ See "The Crimes of Khrushchev" Part 3, Consultations with Gen. Bela Kiraly and Mr. Joseph Kovago, Committee on Un-American Activities, September 10, 1959.

General Kiraly, at present a member of the Hungarian Committee and the executive co-president of Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, Inc., is perhaps the greatest expert on military aspects of the Hungarian revolution in the free world. Born in Kaposvar, Hungary, General Kiraly graduated from the Hungarian Military Academy and was a general staff officer of the Hungarian Army. He participated in World War II and served in the new democratic army following the war. Post-war conditions demanded that he join the Communist Party of Hungary, serving as a general and commander of the Hungarian General Staff College; but in 1951 he was arrested and condemned to death. After serving 5 years in prison, General Kiraly was released on parole in 1956, a month before the revolution broke out. He was elected commander-in-chief of the National Guard of Hungary and Budapest military garrison.

In late November 1956 he was forced to flee Hungary—through Vienna to the United States.

Joseph Kovago, the former mayor of Budapest, Hungary, is currently the vice-chairman of the Assembly of Captive European Nations and vice-chairman of the Hungarian Committee in New York.

Born in Csomoder, Hungary, Mr. Kovago graduated from the Military Academy of Budapest and was an anti-Nazi resistance movement organizer in the last years of World War II. As a candidate of the anti-Communist Smallholders' Party, he was elected the mayor of Budapest in November 1945, and served in that capacity until June 1947, when he was forced to resign.

Following this, Mr. Kovago was arrested and tortured by Communist secret police and spent 6½ years in prison. Released just prior to the revolution, he was again elected as mayor of Budapest on November 2, 1956, but, on November 30th, was forced to flee the country—through several European countries to the United States.

and reestablish the former one-party dictatorship and the authority of the Communist Party.

The Muscovite party leadership decided upon the second.

General Kiraly added that "a peaceful demonstration was transformed into a bloody revolution by the opening of fire of the secret police."

The freedom fighters soon returned the fire and began to make rapid military strides forward. The Communist government ordered an entire regiment to the scene of the revolution to assist the secret police, but the Hungarian soldiers refused to fire upon their countrymen:

* * * this regiment refused to carry out the orders of the Kremlin-led Communist dictators of Hungary, and some of the soldiers joined the freedom fighters; some of the soldiers offered their weapons to the freedom fighters and dispersed and went home.

Some dispersed with their own weapons, but none of the soldiers were willing to carry out the Muscovite order to shoot against their own compatriots.

The third major step in the revolution was the intervention of Soviet troops. According to General Kiraly:

These interfering Soviet armed forces did not carry out even a regular street fight, fighting only freedom-fighter groups. They carried out a terror attack against Budapest with artillery and tanks. They would shoot against a single moving person on the street, against homes, against churches, against apartment houses, without any discrimination.

After 5 days of battle, the Hungarian troops were victorious, and the Soviet leadership found out that they had lost the battle. General Kiraly stated that, to avoid the annihilation of the Soviet units, "Khrushchev himself carried out one of his most sinister actions."

Khrushchev's first deputy, Mikoyan, and Suslov, from the party leadership, were sent to Budapest to sit down with the revolutionary government:

After talking with Khrushchev by means of the telephone—and by the approval of Khrushchev—they concluded an armistice with the Hungarian Government on the 29th of October * * *.

After this valid and legal armistice, concluded by the duly credentialed Soviet delegates and the Hungarian Government, the Hungarian Government let the Soviet troops withdraw from Budapest. The order was reestablished in Budapest. Freedom fighters patrolled the streets; the population was jubilant.

General Kiraly added that for the ceremonial signing of the armistice, the Hungarian delegation was told to go to the Soviet headquarters in Tököl, a village south of Budapest, during the night of November 4, and entered the Soviet building with good faith:

About midnight General Serov entered the room and, no doubt on the order of Khrushchev, arrested the Hungarian delegation. * * *

I believe that one of the most dramatic and most important crimes that ever has been committed in modern times was that diplomatic treachery in Budapest and it was hour to hour carried out by Khrushchev himself. November 4, 1956, the beginning of the second Soviet aggression and the arrest of General Pal Maleter and the Hungarian diplomatic delegation, is the second "day of infamy" of modern history.

In concluding, General Kiraly described the terror attack by Soviet tanks on Hungary and the death of the Hungarian revolution. Today, Hungary is a nationwide prison, "imprisoned by Khrushchev's army units."

In discussing "peaceful coexistence" with the Kremlin, the former Hungarian general stated that it "is as great a fraud as the whole diplomatic action was in Budapest in November, 1956"—

Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence means that the status quo is recognized. The peaceful coexistence of Khrushchev does not intend peacefully to coexist, but does intend to have a direct or indirect recognition of the suppression of one hundred million westernized people from the Baltic down to Bulgaria and Albania.

Joseph Kovago, former mayor of Budapest, testified in great detail about the atrocities of the Soviet rule in Hungary—

From the time that Khrushchev came into power, he is the man responsible for all the mass murders and tortures of the Hungarian men, women, and children.

Mr. Kovago stated that he had been an eyewitness to the mass slaughters by the Soviet tanks as they turned into the streets of Budapest and fired on apartment houses, killing innocent children, women, young and old men without distinction. He counted approximately 30,000 Hungarians slain by the armed forces of Khrushchev and an additional 12,000 deported to the Soviet Union. Counting victims of the secret police, approximately 2,500 persons or more were executed. Hundreds of thousands were imprisoned, and 15,000 were confined to forced labor camps.

Mr. Kovago added that "finally Khrushchev ordered the re-establishment of concentration camps which were abolished before the revolution of 1956." Commenting about the present situation in Hungary, Mr. Kovago testified:

The Hungarian people are in an apathy of despair. The new wave of terror which took place in Hungary after the revolution is increasing, and the complete control by the Soviet Union of the country is so striking and so clear to every Hungarian that the people are gradually losing their hope of regaining freedom.

The prison camps are again full. The conditions are terrible. The secret police are again in action even if they are not so conspicuous today.

Mr. Kovago further testified that more than 200,000 Hungarians managed to escape the country after the revolution and, if they were permitted to do so, "the overwhelming majority of the Hungarian people would not remain."

Concluding his testimony, the former mayor of Budapest commented on the many "faces" of Khrushchev:

I think that Khrushchev is the best disciple of Machiavelli because if his own interest dictates it, he will kill; while he finds it useful, he will smile, will kiss children, will shake hands and show a good face.

THE CRIMES OF KHRUSHCHEV

Part 4

DR. VILIS MASENS

MR. VACLOVAS SIDZIKAIUSKAS

September 21, 1959

Accounts of Communist terror in the Baltic States with bayonets and tanks under Khrushchev's personal control, were related by two former high-ranking Baltic officials, Dr. Vilis Masens and Mr. Vaclovas Sidzikauskas.⁸

Dr. Masens testified:

* * * The aggressive aims and designs, as well as methods of fraud and violence, of international communism basically have not changed under Khrushchev and are, in fact, as cruel as they were under Stalin.

He stated that in Latvia today, there is no such thing as political, religious, or even personal freedom. Under the force of Soviet rule and by the personal direction of Khrushchev, Latvians are deprived of the rights to elect a free government of their choice, to speak freely, to freedom of the press, to freely associate with friends and relatives, or even to move about freely within the country.

"People cannot change their residence without the permission of the police," Dr. Masens testified.

Under the current regime of fear, the number of those who have been able to escape the country has been insignificant, he added:

* * * people dare not go to church for fear that this may harm their position as far as their jobs, educational opportunities, and even their living facilities are concerned. People

⁸ See "The Crimes of Khrushchev," Part 4, Consultations with Dr. Vilis Masens and Mr. Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, Committee on Un-American Activities, September 21, 1959.

Dr. Masens, currently a member of the General Committee and chairman of the Latvian Delegation of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, is acknowledged as one of the best informed experts on Communist activities in Latvia in the free world today. A native Latvian and a graduate of the Law School of the University of Latvia, Dr. Masens served many years as a distinguished member of the Latvian Foreign Service. In recognition of his services, he was awarded nine Latvian and foreign decorations.

During the Soviet and Nazi occupation, Dr. Masens took part in the activities of national resistance groups. He left Latvia in the fall of 1944, on the eve of the second invasion of Latvia by the Communists. Nevertheless, he has continued actively his study of Communist operations in his Latvian homeland, while participating in Latvian exile political organizations.

Mr. Sidzikauskas, at present chairman of the Committee for a Free Lithuania and chairman of the Lithuanian Delegation to the Assembly of Captive European Nations, is recognized as one of the free world's outstanding authorities on Communist operations in Lithuania.

He was a student of law at the University of Moscow during the First World War, and subsequently spent many years in the Lithuanian diplomatic service. Mr. Sidzikauskas witnessed the taking over of Lithuania by the Soviet military forces in June 1940; and in December of that year, he, himself, was apprehended by the NKVD. He escaped to Germany, but was arrested by the Gestapo for being "anti-Nazi" and was placed in the concentration camp of Auschwitz, where he spent 20 months. Following his release he was forced to live in Berlin. When the Russian troops approached the German capital in 1945, he escaped to Bavaria, where he was liberated by the Americans.

Mr. Sidzikauskas, in the post-war years, has been active in the Lithuanian liberation movement and has maintained close contact with Lithuanian affairs.

dare not correspond freely for fear of censorship and persecution.

Instead of the mass deportations of former years, thousands of young Latvians have been compelled to go to "Khrushchev's virgin lands in Kazakhstan," and not for a few years, but, as the Communist publications in Latvia openly state, "for good, to spend all their lives there."

Dr. Masens testified that under General N. S. Zakharov, deputy chief of the NKVD in Latvia in 1949, almost 200,000 persons were deported from Latvia. Many of these "died in Siberian concentration camps" and many "are still in Siberia."

This was the same General Zakharov who accompanied Khrushchev to the recent formal dinner at the White House, Dr. Masens added.

He went on to point out the false assertions by Khrushchev that Soviet Russia has liquidated its military bases on territory of other states. Military and naval bases in Latvia and other Baltic States, according to Dr. Masens, were established by force in 1939. Since that time they have been further expanded, particularly by installing large submarine bases, shelters, and coastal fortifications.

Dr. Masens testified: "These bases constitute a threat to the free nations, particularly to the Scandinavian countries."

He gave accounts of heavy underwater explosions by Soviet naval testing units in the Baltic Sea, many of which have been registered by Swedish seismographic stations.

He pointed out that—

A few years ago in the vicinity of the Latvian coast, near Liepaja, an American plane was shot down by the Soviets, another American plane was later attacked near Ventspils, Latvia.

Vaclovas Sidzikauskas testified:

Khrushchev continues the policy of the Kremlin inaugurated in the time of Stalin, which consists in the continuous suppression of political liberty, of independence and freedom of Lithuania and other Baltic States.

He stated that Khrushchev's intervention into Lithuanian affairs constitutes a breach of the peace treaty, the non-aggression pact, and other legal and political commitments of the U.S.S.R.

Mr. Sidzikauskas added that Khrushchev, at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party, had implicitly endorsed the crimes of Stalin with regard to Lithuania.

"While denouncing some of Stalin's crimes, among them the annihilation of some ethnic groups in Crimea and the Caucasus, he was silent about the crimes committed by Stalin against the Baltic States," Mr. Sidzikauskas continued.

Khrushchev, he said, is co-responsible for such crimes as "military invasion and occupation, suppression of the independence and freedom, mass murders, mass deportations of large portions of the population to Siberia, the forced Sovietization of the country, and economic exploitation of the resources and manpower of Lithuania."

Mr. Sidzikauskas stated that Khrushchev today continues to apply measures aimed at destroying the national identity of the Lithuanian people, not only by physical deportations, but also by new methods of "educating" Lithuanian youth.

When asked: "What will be the reaction in your native land [Lithuania] when the Communist publications feature these pictures of Khrushchev in the White House and Khrushchev meeting the top officials in this country?" Mr. Sidzikauskas replied: "The impact will be disastrous."

In regard to Khrushchev's repeated protestations of peaceful intent, Mr. Sidzikauskas stated:

The protestations of peace by Khrushchev remind me of the similar protestations of Hitler before the outbreak of World War II. At each rally he always protested his desire for peace. Remember "Peace in Our Time"—paper brought to London by Neville Chamberlain and what happened then?

Protestations of peace are proper to all totalitarians. It is the same method that is now used by Khrushchev.

Russian armed forces stay in the heart of Europe. What are their present aims? Peace?

But what does "peace" mean in Russian terms? It means Western acquiescence and acceptance of Soviet conquests. Therefore, they oppose the raising of the question of Central Eastern Europe, be it in the United Nations or summit conference or other international negotiations. If this standing is accepted by the West, Khrushchev is willing to coexist with the West.

And what does "coexist" mean in Russian terms?

As Khrushchev interprets it, the present Soviet grip over Lithuania and other captive European countries is an inescapable fact of his "history"; therefore, the West has no right to touch his colonial empire. As to the free part of the world, Khrushchev is against the status quo and is for something he calls "ideological competition," meaning freedom for communism to make new conquests by subversion.⁹

⁹ Additional consultations on "The Crimes of Khrushchev," are being prepared for release in 1960.

CHAPTER V

PUBLICATIONS

During the year 1959, the committee printed and distributed 450,000 copies of its hearings, consultations, and reports. In addition, in response to requests, it distributed approximately 200,000 copies of committee publications of previous years.

Following is a list of committee hearings, consultations, and reports for the 1st session of the 86th Congress:

HEARINGS

- The Kremlin's Espionage and Terror Organizations. Testimony on March 17, 1959, of Petr S. Deriabin (Former Officer of the U.S.S.R.'s Committee of State Security (KGB)).
- The Southern California District of the Communist Party, Structure—Objectives—Leadership. Part 1, September 2 and 3, 1958 (released in 1959).
- The Southern California District of the Communist Party—Structure—Objectives—Leadership, Part 2, September 4 and 5, 1958 (released in 1959).
- The Southern California District of the Communist Party, Structure—Objectives—Leadership. Part 3, February 24 and 25, 1959.
- Current Strategy and Tactics of Communists in the United States, (Greater Pittsburgh Area). Part 1, March 10, 1959.
- Problems of Security in Industrial Establishments Holding Defense Contracts (Greater Pittsburgh Area). Part 2, March 11, 1959.
- Problems Arising in Cases of Denaturalization and Deportation of Communists (Greater Pittsburgh Area). Part 3, March 12, 1959.
- Communist Infiltration of Vital Industries and Current Communist Techniques in the Chicago, Ill., Area. May 5, 6, and 7, 1959.
- Passport Security (Testimony of Harry R. Bridges). Part 1, April 21, 1959.
- Passport Security. Part 2, April 22, 23, 24, and June 5, 1959.
- The American National Exhibition, Moscow, July 1, 1959.
- Communist Training Operations. Part 1, July 21 and 22, 1959.
- Testimony of Clinton Edward Jencks, July 22, 1959.
- Testimony of Arnold Johnson, Legislative Director of the Communist Party, U.S.A. September 22, 1959.
- Western Section of the Southern California District of the Communist Party. Part 1, October 20, 1959 (will be printed during 1960).
- Western Section of the Southern California District of the Communist Party. Part 2, October 21, 1959 (will be printed during 1960).
- Western Section of the Southern California District of the Communist Party. Part 3, October 22, 1959 (will be printed during 1960).
- Communist Activities Among Puerto Ricans in New York City and in Puerto Rico (New York City—Part 1), November 16 and 17; (San Juan, Puerto Rico—Part 2), November 18, 19, and 20, 1959 (will be printed during 1960).

CONSULTATIONS

- Language as a Communist Weapon. Dr. Stefan T. Possony, March 2, 1959.
- Communist Persecution of Churches in Red China and Northern Korea. Five Church Leaders: Rev. Peter Chu Pong, Rev. Shih-ping Wang, Rev. Tsin-tsai Liu, Rev. Samuel W. S. Cheng, Mr. Kyung Rai Kim, March 26, 1959.
- Control of the Arts in the Communist Empire. Ivan P. Bahriany, June 3, 1959.
- The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part 1. Mr. Eugene Lyons, September 4, 1959.
- The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part 2. Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Mr. Petro Pavlovych, Prof. Dr. Ivan M. Malinin, Mr. Nicholas Prychodko, Mr. Constantin Kononenko, Mr. Mykola Lebed, Dr. Gregory Kostiuk, Prof. Ivan Wowchuk, Mr. Juriy Lawrynenko, September 9-11, 1959.
- The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part 3. Gen. Bela Kiraly and Mr. Joseph Kovago, September 10, 1959.
- The Crimes of Khrushchev, Part 4. Dr. Vilis Masens and Mr. Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, September 21, 1959.

REPORTS

- Communist Legal Subversion, The Role of the Communist Lawyer. H. Rept. No. 41, February 16, 1959.
- Report on the Southern California District of the Communist Party, Structure—Objectives—Leadership, H. Rept. No. 259, April 3, 1959.
- Who Are They?—Karl Marx. Part 10, August 28, 1959.
- Communist Lobbying Activities in the Nation's Capital. September 3, 1959.
- The Communist Parcel Operation. September 25, 1959.
- Facts on Communism—Volume I—Communist Ideology. December 1959.
- Annual Report for 1959.

PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Following is a select list of publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities which are available from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.:

Asterisks indicate publications which are presently available without charge from the Committee on Un-American Activities.

REPORTS

*Communist conspiracy, strategy and tactics of world communism; pt. 1, Communism outside United States:	<i>Price</i>
Sec. A, Marxist classics. Catalog No. 84-2:H.rp.2240-----	\$0.60
Sec. B, The U.S.S.R. Catalog No. 84-2:H.rp.2241-----	1.50
Sec. C., The World Congresses of the Communist International. Catalog No. 84-2:H.rp.2242-----	1.00
Sec. D, Communist activities around the world. Catalog No. 84-2:H.rp.2243-----	1.50
Sec. E, The Comintern and the CPUSA (Communist Party of the United States of America). Catalog No. 84-2:H.rp.2244-----	1.00

REPORTS—continued

Great pretense symposium on anti-Stalinism and 20th Congress of Soviet Communist Party; report from Committee on Un-American Activities, 84th Cong., May 21, 1956. Catalog No. 84-2:H.rp.2189-----	Price \$0.45
Trial by treason, National Committee to Secure Justice for Rosenbergs and Morton Sobell. Catalog No. 85-1:H.doc.206-----	.45
Soviet total war, historic mission of violence and deceit: Vol. 1, Sept. 23, 1956. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2:So 8/3/v.1-----	1.25
Vol. 2, Sept. 30, 1956. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2:So 8/3/v.2-----	1.50
Communist political subversion—the campaign to destroy security programs of the United States Government. Catalog No. 85-1:H.rp.1182--	.45
*Guide to subversive organizations and publications (and appendix), revised as of Jan. 2, 1957. Catalog No. 85-1:H. Doc. 226-----	.45
Operation abolition, campaign against House Committee on Un-American Activities, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Government security program, by Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and its affiliates, Nov. 8, 1957. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2:Op 2-----	.15
Organized communism in the United States, Aug. 19, 1953. (Revised May 1958). Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2:C 73/35/958-----	.45
Chronicle of treason, Committee on Un-American Activities, 85th Cong., 2d sess. (Reprint of series of articles by Francis E. Walter, appearing in Philadelphia Inquirer May 3-9, 1958.) Catalog No. Y 4Un 1/2:T 71/3-----	.15
*House Committee on Un-American Activities, what it is, what it does, July 1958. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2:Un 1/12/958-----	.15
Patterns of Communist espionage, report by Committee on Un-American Activities, 85th Cong., 2d sess., Jan. 1959. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2:C 73/101-----	.25
Who are they? prepared at request of Committee on Un-American Activities by Legislative Reference Service of Library of Congress: Catalog No. Y4.Un 1/2:W 62/(pt.)	
Pt. 1, Khrushchev and Bulganin (U.S.S.R.)-----	.10
Pt. 2, Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai (Communist China)-----	.10
Pt. 3, Georgi Zhukov and Ivan Konev (U.S.S.R.)-----	.10
Pt. 4, Walter Ulbricht and Janos Kadar (East Germany and Hungary)-----	.10
Pt. 5, Josip Broz Tito and Wladyslaw Gomułka (Yugoslavia-Poland)-----	.10
Pt. 6, Kim Il Sung and Ho Chi Minh (North Korea-North Viet-Nam)-----	.10
Pt. 7, Maurice Thorez and Palmiro Togliatti (France-Italy)-----	.10
Pt. 8, Vicente Lombardo Toledano and Luis Carlos Prestes (Mexico-Brazil)-----	.10
Pt. 9, Enver Hoxha (Albania) and Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej (Rumania)-----	.15
Pt. 10, Karl Marx-----	.10
Communist Legal Subversion (The Role of the Communist Lawyer), 86th Cong., 1st sess., Feb. 16, 1959. Catalog No. 86/1:H. Rpt. 41-----	.25
*The Kremlin's Espionage and Terror Organizations, testimony of Petr S. Deriabin, Former Officer of the U.S.S.R.'s Committee of State Security (KGB), 86th Cong., 1st sess., Released Mar. 17, 1959. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2:K88-----	.15
*Report on the Southern California District of the Communist Party (Structure-Objectives-Leadership), 86th Cong., 1st sess., Apr. 3, 1959. Catalog No. 86/1:H. Rpt. 259-----	.35
*Communist Lobbying Activities in the Nation's Capital, Committee on Un-American Activities, 86th Cong., 1st sess., Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2:C73/105-----	.10
*The Communist Parcel Operation, Committee on Un-American Activities, 86th Cong., 1st sess., Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2:C73/106-----	.15
Facts On Communism, Volume I, The Communist Ideology—Committee on Un-American Activities, 86th Cong., 1st sess., Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2:C73/108/Vol. 1-----	.45

CONSULTATIONS

International communism (revolt in the Satellites), staff consultations with Dr. Jan Karski, Mihail Farcasanu, Joseph Lipski, Monsignor Bela Varga, Bela Fabian, Stevan Barankovics, Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, Ferenc Nagy, Committee on Un-American Activities, 84th Cong., 2d sess., Oct. 29–Nov. 20, 1956. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: C 73/72-----	.25
---	-----

CONSULTATIONS—continued

International communism (communist control of Estonia), staff consultation with August Rei, Committee on Un-American Activities, House, 85th Cong., 1st sess., May 10, 1957. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2:C 73/78-----	Price \$0.15
International communism (the communist mind), staff consultation with Frederick Charles Schwarz, Committee on Un-American Activities, House, 85th Cong., 1st sess., May 29, 1957. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2:C 73/76-----	.15
International communism (communist penetration of Malaya and Singapore), staff consultation with Kuo-Shuen Chang, Committee on Un-American Activities, House, 85th Cong., 1st sess., May 29, 1957. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: C 73/79-----	.15
International communism (communist trade offensive), staff consultations with Joseph Anthony Marcus, Christopher Emmet, Nicolas de Rochefort, Committee on Un-American Activities, House, 85th Cong., 1st sess., June 26, 1957. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: C 73/82-----	.15
*International communism (present posture of the free world), staff consultation with Constantine Brown, Committee on Un-American Activities, House, 85th Cong., 1st sess., Oct. 21, 1957. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: C 73/86-----	.15
Ideological fallacies of communism, staff consultations with S. Andhil Fineberg, Fulton J. Sheen, Daniel A. Poling, Committee on Un-American Activities, House, 85th Cong., 1st sess., Sept. 4-Oct. 18, 1957. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: C 73/84-----	.15
International communism (communist designs on Indonesia and Pacific frontier), staff consultation with Charles A. Willoughby, former Chief of Intelligence, Far Eastern Command, under Douglas MacArthur, Committee on Un-American Activities, House, Dec. 16, 1957. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: C 73/87-----	.30
Communist psychological warfare (brainwashing), consultation with Edward Hunter. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: C 73/90-----	.15
International communism (communist propaganda activities in Canada), consultation with Milan Jakubec, President of the Executive Council of Mutual Co-operation League of Canada, Apr. 3, 1958. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: C 73/92-----	.15
International communism (communist encroachment in the Far East), consultation with Major General Claire Lee Chennault, Committee on Un-American Activities, 85th Cong., 2d sess., Apr. 23, 1958. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: C 73/94-----	.15
Communist strategy of protracted conflict, consultation with Robert Strausz-Hupe, Alvin J. Cottrell, James E. Dougherty, Committee on Un-American Activities, 85th Cong., 2d sess., May 20, 1958. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: C 73/97-----	.15
*Ideology of freedom vs. ideology of communism, consultation with Charles Wesley Lowry, chairman and executive director of Foundation for Religious Action in Social and Civil Order, Committee on Un-American Activities, 85th Cong., 2d sess., June 5, 1958. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: F 87-----	.15
Irrationality of communism, consultation with Gerhart Niemeyer, Committee on Un-American Activities, 85th Cong., 2d sess., Aug. 8, 1958. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: C 73/99-----	.15
*International communism in Yugoslavia, myth of "Titoism", consultation with Dr. Alex N. Dragnich, Committee on Un-American Activities, 85th Cong., 2d sess., Sept. 15, 1958. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: C 73/100-----	.15
*Language as a communist weapon, consultation with Dr. Stefan T. Possony. Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: L 26-----	.20
The Crimes of Khrushchev—Committee on Un-American Activities, 86th Cong., 1st sess., Catalog No. Y 4.Un 1/2: K52:-----	
Part 1, Sept. 4, 1959-----	.15
Part 2, Sept. 9-11, 1959-----	.25
Part 3, Sept. 10, 1959-----	.15
Part 4, Sept. 21, 1959-----	.15
*Communist Persecution of Churches in Red China and Northern Korea, Consultation with Rev. Peter Chu Pong, Rev. Shih-ping Wang, Rev. Tsin-tsai Liu, Rev. Samuel W. S. Cheng, Mr. Kyung Rai Kim, Committee on Un-American Activities, 86th Cong., 1st sess., March 26, 1959. Catalog No. Y 4. Un 1/2: C 47-----	.15

CHAPTER VI

REFERENCE SERVICE

Thank you for the very informative and factual report * * *. I am extremely impressed with the impartial approach which your committee has used in preparing this report, and I should like to state for the record that this is the sort of information and approach that I can understand and appreciate.

The foregoing excerpt of a letter from a Member of the Congress exemplifies the appraisal by the members of the reports which the committee furnishes to executive agencies of the Government and to Members of the Congress. These reports are based on a vast and ever increasing amount of public source material which the committee integrates into a single, well-classified and indexed collection. In 1959, there were received from the Members of the Congress 1,733 separate requests for information from committee public source material involving one or more individuals or organizations. This represented a 25% increase over similar requests made by members of the Congress during 1958. In response to these requests the reference staff of the committee ran checks of the committee public source material on 2,984 individuals and on 1,239 organizations and general subjects. These checks revealed information in 1,765 cases, and written reports were supplied by the committee to the members requesting the information.

Twenty-four agencies of the executive department of the Government used the reference service of the committee during 1959. Several of these agencies have representatives who are regularly assigned to the committee offices for the purpose of procuring information from the committee's public source material.

In servicing the investigative and research units of the committee's staff, the reference section, during 1959, processed 1,351 staff requests involving checks for information on 2,802 individuals, 800 organizations, and on a number of specific subjects. This processing involved the preparation of 2,395 exhibits and the preparation of 1,301 written reports.

CHAPTER VII

CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS

The House of Representatives in 1959 voted contempt citations against *Edwin A. Alexander* and *Martin Popper*, who, as witnesses before the Committee on Un-American Activities, refused to answer pertinent questions on constitutional grounds which specifically omitted the self-incrimination privilege of the fifth amendment. House contempt resolutions have been certified by the Speaker to the proper United States Attorneys for prosecutive action. The case of *Edwin A. Alexander* has not as yet been presented to a Grand Jury. *Martin Popper* was indicted November 24, 1959, and his case has been set for trial March 7, 1960.

Edwin A. Alexander, a resident of Chicago, was a witness before the committee on May 6, 1959, in Chicago, at which time the committee was investigating Communist penetration of vital industries and current techniques of the Communist Party in the Chicago area. He refused to testify regarding the identification of members of the Communist Party who were active in 1956.

Martin Popper, former secretary of the National Lawyers Guild and presently engaged in the practice of law in the city of New York, was a witness before the committee in Washington, D.C., on June 5, 1959, at which time the committee was studying methods of filling the "gap" in Federal law created by the passport decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Rockwell Kent* and *Walter Briehl v. John Foster Dulles*. Mr. Popper refused to answer three questions relating to Communist Party activities or affiliation which he had left unanswered in his 1958 application for issuance of a passport.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS IN 1959

The Supreme Court of the United States had occasion to review during 1959 two cases of contempt of the House of Representatives, which had their origin before the Committee on Un-American Activities. One was the case of *Lloyd Barenblatt* whose conviction was affirmed on June 8, 1959, by a divided court. The other was the case of *Horace Chandler Davis*, whose application for a writ of certiorari was denied on December 8, 1959. A sentence of 6 months in jail and a fine of \$250 was imposed in both cases. A recent motion to reduce the *Barenblatt* sentence was denied.

The *Barenblatt* case is a landmark in the field of contempt law. *Barenblatt* was identified as a member of the Communist Party and was cited for contempt arising from his refusal to answer pertinent questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities on June 28, 1954. His conviction in the District Court was affirmed by a divided court in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. An order was entered in the Supreme Court of the United

States on June 24, 1957, granting certiorari and remanding the case for consideration under the decision in the *Watkins* case. On January 16, 1958, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia for the second time affirmed the conviction by a divided court. It was on an appeal from this latter decision that the Supreme Court of the United States reversed its trend in contempt cases and sustained the conviction.

The major issue involved in the Supreme Court decision was the construction of the language of the Supreme Court contained in the *Watkins* case relative to the validity of the resolution creating the standing Committee on Un-American Activities. In holding that the decision in the *Watkins* case cannot be read as standing for the proposition that the enabling resolution creating the committee is invalid because of vagueness, Justice Harlan, in rendering the opinion of the Court, stated that "in pursuance of its legislative concerns in the domain of 'national security' the House has clothed the Un-American Activities Committee with pervasive authority to investigate Communist activities in this country."

The *Davis* case is second in importance only to the *Barenblatt* case. *Davis* pursued graduate studies at Harvard University in 1950, and subsequently was employed in the teaching profession at the University of Michigan. When appearing as a witness before the committee in Lansing, Michigan, on May 10, 1954, he refused to answer pertinent questions relating to Communist Party activities and purposes within the teaching profession. The case was tried on November 19, 1956. A judgment of guilty was entered on June 27, 1957, ten days after the *Watkins* case was decided. Conviction was affirmed by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit on August 21, 1959, 269 Fed. 2d 357.

This case arose prior to the *Watkins* case, but the District Court judgment was not handed down until subsequently. The case is particularly noteworthy for the reason that Judge Kent of the District Court for the Western District of Michigan was the first member of the judiciary to disagree with the sweeping statements made by way of obiter dicta by Chief Justice Warren in the *Watkins* case relative to investigatory power of the Committee on Un-American Activities, a conclusion reached much later in the *Barenblatt* case and followed by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in affirming the *Davis* case.

CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DECISIONS IN 1959

In addition to the decision of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit affirming the *Davis* case, the convictions of *Carl Braden* and *Frank Wilkinson* were affirmed by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit on the 10th day of December, 1959, and the 14th day of December, 1959, respectively.

Carl Braden, formerly a newspaper copy editor, appeared as a witness before the committee in Atlanta, Georgia, on July 29, 1958. He was convicted on January 30, 1959, and sentenced to 1 year in jail for refusal to answer pertinent questions relating to membership in the Communist Party and his participation in Communist propaganda activities focused on the South. He assigned as reasons for his refusal

to answer questions, the first amendment to the United States Constitution, invalidity of the committee, and lack of pertinency of the questions to the subject under inquiry; and these were the issues in the case. The conviction was affirmed on the basis of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Barenblatt* case.

Frank Wilkinson, a resident of Los Angeles, California, was subpoenaed as a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities at its hearings conducted in Atlanta, Georgia, on July 29, 1958. *Wilkinson*, at the time, was engaged in Atlanta in the activities of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, of which he was an official. He refused to answer pertinent questions relating to the activities and purposes of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee in the Atlanta area and based his refusal to answer on the claim that the Committee on Un-American Activities was illegally established and on what he termed "a matter of conscience and personal responsibility." His conviction was likewise sustained on the basis of the decision in the *Barenblatt* case.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DECISIONS IN 1959

In addition to the convictions of *Carl Braden* and *Frank Wilkinson* on January 30, 1959, *Louis Earl Hartman* was convicted in San Francisco, California, on July 23, 1959, and sentenced to 6 months in jail and fined \$100. *Donald Wheeldin* was convicted in Los Angeles on December 11, 1959, sentencing being postponed to February 8, 1960. *Sidney Turoff* was convicted in Buffalo, New York, on the 14th day of December, 1959, and sentenced to 90 days in jail and a fine of \$100. The indictment against *Herbert Ingerman* was dismissed by the Court on December 14, 1959, at Buffalo, New York, and the indictment against *William E. Davis*, obtained in St. Louis in November 1956, was dismissed in August 1959.

CASES PENDING

Convictions in the cases of *John T. Gojack*, *Goldie Watson*, *Norton Anthony Russell* and *Bernhard Deutch* are pending on appeal in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The following cases are awaiting trial in district courts: *Peter Seeger*, *Elliott Sullivan*, *George Tyne*, *Frank Grumman*, *Bernard Silber*, *Robert Lehrer*, *Victor Malis*, *Alfred James Samter*, *Edward Yellin*, and *Harvey O'Connor*, in addition to *Edwin A. Alexander* and *Martin Popper*, mentioned at the beginning of this section.

IS THE PENDULUM SLOWLY SWINGING BACK TO THE PRE-1950 RECORD OF SUSTAINED CONVICTIONS IN CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS CASES?

If the foregoing question is to be answered in the affirmative, the Congress will be encouraged to anticipate greater success in the future in obtaining information vital to the defense of the Nation and essential for self-preservation of the Government. If the question is to be answered in the negative, new means of approach must be devised to prevent the Congress from becoming impotent in this vital area.

The committee is indebted to William Hitz, Assistant United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, one of the country's foremost

authorities in this field, for the following statistical information relating to contempt cases in the District of Columbia, where approximately two-thirds of all contempt cases originate and are tried.

Title 2, Section 192, of the United States Code, commonly referred to as the Contempt Statute, was enacted into law on January 24, 1857, more than 100 years ago. From that date to and including the convictions of the Hollywood Ten in 1950, there were 64 congressional contempt citations in the District of Columbia resulting in 62 indictments. Of these citations, 39 originated with the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Out of the 53¹ cases tried between 1857 and 1950, there were 42 convictions and 11 acquittals. *Not one of the 42 convictions was reversed on appeal.* Jail sentences were imposed in 32 of the cases. *Townsend*, one of those sentenced, was pardoned, and *Eisler*, another, absconded. Therefore, 30 defendants served jail sentences under congressional contempt prosecutions in the District of Columbia prior to 1950.

The foregoing record of unreversed convictions prior to 1950 stands out in vivid contrast with the record since that date. The first reversal ordered by the United States Supreme Court of any statutory congressional contempt conviction from any jurisdiction was one in which the Court approved the reversal by the Court of Appeals in the conviction of *Edward A. Rumely* in the District of Columbia.² *Rumely*, secretary of an organization known as the Committee for Constitutional Government, refused in June 1950 to disclose to the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of the House of Representatives, the names of those who made purchases of a certain book for distribution. Avoiding constitutional questions relating to the first amendment, the Supreme Court of the United States held that *Rumely* was not required to furnish this information on the ground that the committee had no authority under its enabling resolution to compel its production. This was followed by reversals of convictions by the Supreme Court in the *Emspak*, *Quinn*, *Bart*, *Watkins*, *Sacher*, and *Flaxer* cases and by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in the *Bowers*, *Keeney*, *Grossman*, *O'Connor*, *Singer*, *Brewster*, *LaPoma*, and *Miller* cases.

From 1950 to December 31, 1959, there have been 102 congressional contempt citations in the District of Columbia, three withdrawn citations not being included. Of this number, 83 were indicted, 17 were ignored by grand juries, 1 died before indictment, and the record of disposition of 1 cannot be located. Out of the 83 indicted, 30 were convicted, and 47 were either acquitted or dismissed at the instance of the Government.³ Seven cases are awaiting trial. Fifteen of the 30 convictions were reversed on appeal and 9 cases are pending in the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. *Only one of the 16 convictions reviewed by the appellate courts in the District of Columbia since 1950 has been finally sustained and that was the Barenblatt case decided June 8, 1959.*

¹ Included are pleas of guilty (2) and nolo contendere (2).

² Available records show that prior to this first reversal by the Supreme Court of a contempt conviction, circuit courts of appeals had reversed convictions of Marcello and Poretto (Louisiana, 1952), Aiuppa (Ohio, 1952), and Bowers (District of Columbia, 1953). None of these cases reached the Supreme Court.

³ The conviction of Mary Jane Keeney was reversed in the Circuit Court of Appeals and on retrial she was acquitted. Her case is included both in the number of convictions and the number of acquittals.

Henry Grunewald, one of those convicted of contempt of Congress, was placed on probation. Subsequently, he violated the provisions of his probation and was required to serve his sentence. *Timothy O'Mara* was likewise convicted and was given a jail sentence to run concurrently with a sentence which he was then serving. It can therefore be said that the only jail sentence required to be served in the District of Columbia in congressional contempt cases subsequent to 1950, other than the violation of probation case and the concurrent sentence case, is that imposed upon *Barenblatt*.

The disposition of the congressional contempt cases in the District of Columbia from 1857 to the present time, is reflected by the following chart:

	1857-1949	1950-60	Total
Number of citations.....	64	102	166
Citations withdrawn and not included.....	0	3	3
Died before indictment.....	0	1	1
Citations ignored by grand juries.....	1	17	18
Indicted.....	62	83	145
Died before trial.....	1	0	1
Convicted.....	142	30	72
Acquitted or dismissed by Government.....	19	147	66
Jail sentences imposed.....	32	16	48
Placed on probation.....	10	14	24
Jail sentences served (not including Grunewald).....	30	2	32
Convictions reversed.....	0	15	15
Convictions sustained on final review.....	13	1	14
Convictions pending on appeal (6 are jail sentences).....	0	9	9

¹ The conviction of Mary Jane Keeney was reversed in the Circuit Court of Appeals and on retrial she was acquitted. Her case is included both in the number of convictions and the number of acquittals.

² In addition, there were five convictions not reviewed on appeal.

The above chart depicts the disposition of all District of Columbia cases of contempt of Congress. The following chart is limited to those dealing with subversives:

	1857-1949	1950-57	Total
Number of citations.....	39	51	90
Indicted.....	38	48	86
Convicted.....	35	23	58
Jail sentences imposed.....	27	14	41
Probation.....	8	9	17
Reversed.....	0	11	11
Pending on appeal.....	0	9	9
Jail sentences served.....	26	1	27

Clarence Hiskey, an atomic scientist alleged to have engaged in Soviet espionage, was the first witness to be cited for contempt of Congress after claiming the fifth-amendment privilege against self-incrimination. *Hiskey* refused to answer many questions concerning his activities when he appeared before the committee on May 24, 1949. He was cited for contempt, not because he refused to answer questions based upon this privilege, but because it was considered that he had waived the privilege or had claimed it prematurely, without right, or in

bad faith. There were earlier instances of reliance upon the fifth amendment by witnesses who were not cited for contempt.

Yukio Abe and *Ralph Tokunaga* were similarly cited as a result of refusing to answer questions of this committee in Honolulu, Hawaii, in April 1950. *Abe* and *Tokunaga* were indicted and brought to trial in Honolulu on January 15, 1951, and on the same day were acquitted, the Court sustaining their reliance on the fifth amendment before the committee. This is believed to be the first occasion in which a court applied to a witness before a congressional committee the fifth-amendment provision that no person "shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself." *Clarence Hiskey* was acquitted in the District of Columbia on April 13, 1951.

Then followed efforts by Federal prosecutors in Washington and in other parts of the country to determine in the courts the limits or availability of this asserted reason for refusing to answer questions of the legislative branch. Not only did all of the prosecutions of fifth-amendment witnesses result in acquittals, but no limitations appear to have been established in the courts to the use of this privilege as an excuse, and later a defense, for refusals to answer. Not a single sustained conviction was had where this privilege was actually claimed and was not waived by other answers of the witness. Unlike the individual's first-amendment rights of silence and freedom of speech, his freedom from self-incrimination, when claimed, is held to prevail over Congress' right to inform itself in its legislative functions, and that even where the national security is involved.⁴

Frequent inquiry is made as to the maximum penalty for contempt of Congress, and the range of sentences imposed. Title 2, Section 192, provides that a person who refuses to answer any question pertinent to the inquiry shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000 nor less than \$100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not less than 1 month, nor more than 12 months. The record of jail sentences imposed in the District of Columbia from 1857 to 1959, inclusive, together with the name of the Judge imposing the sentence and the date of imposition, is given below:

SENTENCES OF 30 DAYS

Chapman (Cole, J., 1896)

Sinclair (Hitz, J., 1929)

Townsend (Gordon, J. Apr. 11, 1938; pardoned Apr. 18, 1938)

Russell (Christianson, J., 1956)

SENTENCE OF 2 MONTHS

Flaxer (Matthews, J., 1953)

SENTENCES OF 90 DAYS

Fields (Holtzoff, J., 1947)

O'Mara (Holtzoff, J., 1954)

Deutch (Holtzoff, J., 1956)

⁴ Hitz on Summary of Contempt Proceedings, XIV The Federal Bar Journal 165.

SENTENCES OF 3 MONTHS

Auslander (Keech, J., 1947)	Fast (Keech, J., 1947)
Chodorov (Keech, J., 1947)	Leider (Keech, J., 1947)
Justiz (Keech, J., 1947)	Magana (Keech, J., 1947)
Lustig (Keech, J., 1947)	Stern (Keech, J., 1947)
Miller (Keech, J., 1947)	Fleischman (Keech, J., 1948)
Bryan (Keech, J., 1948)	Morford (Morris, J., 1950)
Marshall (Keech, J., 1948)	Liveright (Keech, J., 1957)
Bart (Matthews, J., 1951)	Price (Keech, J., 1957)
Bradley (Keech, J., 1947)	

SENTENCES OF 4 MONTHS

Kamp (Moore, J., 1948)	Knowles (Rizley, J., 1957)
------------------------	----------------------------

SENTENCES OF 6 MONTHS

Barsky (Keech, J., 1947)	Biberman (Keech, J., 1950)
Dmytryk (Keech, J., 1950)	Emspak (Letts, J., 1951)
Quinn (Kirkland, J., 1951)	Barenblatt (Holtzoff, J., 1956)
Sacher (Holtzoff, J., 1956)	Shelton (Rizley, J., 1957)

SENTENCE OF 9 MONTHS

Gojack (Pine, J., 1956)

SENTENCES OF 12 MONTHS

Dennis (Pine, J., 1947)	Eisler (Holtzoff, J., 1947)
Lawson (Curran, J., 1948)	Trumbo (Pine, J., 1948)
Maltz (Pine, J., 1950)	Bessie (Pine, J., 1950)
Ornitz (Pine, J., 1950)	Scott (Curran, J., 1950)
Lardner (Curran, J., 1950)	Cole (Curran, J., 1950)
Grossman (Holtzoff, J., 1954)	Brewster (Sirica, J., 1958)

The committee has viewed with alarm the trend of decisions by the Supreme Court of the United States and the lower courts of appeal in contempt cases reviewed since 1950, but it is encouraged in the belief that the recent decision in the *Barenblatt* case, and even more recent decision in the Michigan case of *Horace Chandler Davis*, indicates a trend in the direction of a better understanding and appreciation of the vital investigatory problems of Congress.

CHAPTER VIII

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

In its Annual Report for 1958, this committee made a number of legislative recommendations for the purpose of lessening the impact of court decisions on the enforcement of laws and regulations relating to subversives. These recommendations were in the fields of:

1. Passport legislation;
2. State sedition laws;
3. The "organization" clause of the Smith Act;
4. The "advocacy" clause of the Smith Act; and
5. The Federal Loyalty Program.

The committee, as the result of continued investigations, is of the opinion that there is still urgent need for the adoption of remedial legislation in each of these fields.

1. PASSPORTS

The committee believes that the most critical problem in the passport field is the lack of legislative authority in the Secretary of State to deny passports to dangerous participants in the international Communist conspiracy.

In its Annual Report for 1956, this committee emphasized the importance of statutory recognition of the basic regulations then governing passport matters and the giving of specific statutory authority to the Secretary of State to issue substantive regulations in the passport field.

In June 1958, by a 5-4 majority, the Supreme Court decided in the *Kent-Briehl* and the *Dayton* cases that the Secretary of State's regulations embodying the executive policy of denying passports to supporters of the world Communist movement, were invalid because of a lack of specific legislative authority. This "gap" found in the law is pointed out in this committee's Annual Report for the year 1958, with an urgent appeal for the adoption of strong legislation in keeping with the committee's 1956 recommendations.

Extensive passport hearings were held from April to June 1959, with the appearance of John W. Hanes, Jr., Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State, as a witness. This testimony pointed up the immediate necessity of remedial legislation in this field.

Eighteen bills, including H.R. 2232 by the chairman, were introduced during the 1st session of the Congress dealing with the problem of issuance of passports. H.R. 9069, introduced on September 3, 1959, represents a compromise approach to the subject and was passed by the House of Representatives September 8, 1959. There has been no Senate action. This bill provides for the denial or revocation of a passport for any person who is, or has been since January 1, 1951, a

member of, or affiliated with, the Communist Party, or knowingly engages, or has knowingly engaged since January 1, 1951, in activities intended to further the international Communist movement.

The committee recognizes the difficulty in reaching all the problems in the field of passport law at one time in one bill and, therefore, urges the adoption of H.R. 9069 as a beginning, and suggests further study of the previous recommendations of this committee and the provisions of the other bills presented in this field. The committee deems it appropriate to suggest to the State Department that, pending the adoption of effective legislation authorizing the denial of passports to supporters of international communism, security investigations of applicants for passports be made in order that the Government may be fully informed of the subversive character and dangerous potentialities of passport applicants and holders as a matter of normal precaution against the sudden creation of a national emergency.

2. STATE SEDITION LAWS

As pointed out in the committee's Annual Report for 1958, the sedition laws of 42 States of the Union fell with the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Pennsylvania v. Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497 (1956), which held that the Smith Act preempted the field of sedition and subversion in favor of the Federal Government. This decision, it was asserted, reads into the statute the legislative intent of Congress to occupy the whole field of the law of sedition or subversion to the exclusion of State and local governments.

By a divided court, in the case of *Uphaus v. Wyman*, 360 U.S. 72 (1959), the Supreme Court appears to have limited to some extent its holding in the *Nelson* case by stating that it was the precise holding of the court in the *Nelson* case that "the Smith Act, which prohibits the knowing advocacy of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence, supersedes the enforceability of the Pennsylvania Sedition Act which proscribed the *same conduct*." Notwithstanding this effort to lessen the impact of the *Nelson* decision upon State sedition laws, the great uncertainty that exists in the state of law relating to this vital subject should be clarified once and for all by congressional action.

Among numerous bills offered on this subject in both the House and Senate during the 85th Congress, H.R. 3, providing that no act of Congress should be construed as indicating a congressional intent to occupy the field in which such act operates to the exclusion of all State laws on the subject matter, unless such act contains an express provision to that effect, was passed by the House, but failed by one vote of adoption by the Senate. An identical bill was offered as H.R. 3 in the 1st session of the 86th Congress which passed the House on June 24, 1959, but has not yet reached the floor of the Senate.

This committee strongly recommends that the indicated remedial legislation be enacted into law.

3. THE "ORGANIZATION" CLAUSE OF THE SMITH ACT

Congressional intent was likewise involved in the *Yates* case, in which the Supreme Court of the United States dealt a lethal blow to the Smith Act. The Court held that the statute of limitations

barred conviction, since the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act refers only to the initial formation of the Communist Party in 1945, as distinguished from continuing acts of organizing and recruiting.

The chairman of this committee offered a bill during the 85th Congress for the purpose of clarifying the meaning of the term "organize" as it is used in the Smith Act, Title 18, U.S.C., 2385, making the term applicable to the recruiting of new members, the forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing groups, classes, and other units of such society, group, or assembly of persons. This bill was passed by the House in the 85th Congress, but did not come to a vote in the Senate. It was reoffered during the 1st session of the 86th Congress as H.R. 2369, and passed the House on March 2, 1959. It has not come to a vote in the Senate.

The committee is of the opinion that if the Smith Act is to remain one of our most effective weapons against the Communist conspiracy, it is vital that H.R. 2369 be enacted into law, and it urgently recommends its passage.

4. THE "ADVOCACY" CLAUSE OF THE SMITH ACT

The need for clarification of congressional intent with respect to the terms "advocate" and "teach" as used in the Smith Act is indicated by the decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in reversing the conviction of six second-rank Communist leaders for violation of the Smith Act, *United States v. James E. Jackson, et al.*, C.C.A. 2d, 1958, 257 Fed. 2d 830. This decision was based upon the "call to action" test laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Yates* case. In commenting upon the holding in the *Yates* case, the Court stated:

In distinguishing this extremely narrow difference between advocacy or teaching which constitutes a violation from that which does not, the Supreme Court said: "The essential distinction is that those to whom the advocacy is addressed must be urged to *do* something now or in the future, rather than merely *believe* in something."

The committee is of the opinion that the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Yates* case, in attempting to construe the terms "advocate" and "teach" as terms of art, failed to ascertain the obvious intent of Congress as disclosed by the customary meaning of those terms when used in conjunction with the terms "duty" and "necessity." The question of whether advocacy and teaching of the *duty* and *necessity* of overthrowing the Government by use of force and violence constitutes mere advocacy and teaching of an abstract doctrine or whether it is advocacy or teaching directed at promoting of unlawful action, was neither considered nor decided by the Court in the *Yates* case. To construe the terms "advocate" and "teach" out of the context in which they were used could only result in doing violence to the plain intent of Congress in the use of those terms.

The chairman, during the 85th Congress, offered an amendment to Title 18, United States Code, Section 2385, which sought to clarify the congressional intent by defining the terms "advocate," "teach," "necessity," "force," and "violence," as used in that section. The bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which took no action.

An identical bill was offered by the chairman on January 9, 1959, and no action has as yet been taken.

The committee considers it essential that the Smith Act be strengthened and buttressed by the adoption of the suggested legislation and the consideration of any other legislative proposal which would renew the effectiveness of the Smith Act as a weapon in the national defense and the internal security of the country.

5. FEDERAL LOYALTY PROGRAM

The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Cole v. Young*, 351 U.S. 536 (1956), has limited greatly the effectiveness of the Summary Suspension Act of 1950 and Executive Order 10450 issued thereunder. The Act involved provides that the heads of certain Government agencies may suspend a civilian officer or employee whenever he shall determine such termination necessary or advisable in the interest of the national security of the United States. In holding that dismissal of an employee was not authorized by the 1950 Act, the Court held that the term "National Security" is used in the Act in a definite and limited sense and relates only to those activities which are directly concerned with the Nation's safety.

The committee views with alarm the fact that 76 civilian employees suspended by the heads of Government agencies under the Federal Loyalty Program have been reemployed since the decision in the *Cole* case. Congress should be reminded of the statement in the dissenting opinion by Mr. Justice Clark that—

It is not realistic to say that the Government can be protected merely by applying the act to sensitive jobs. One never knows just which job is sensitive. The janitor might prove to be in as important a spot securitywise as the top employee in the building. The Congress decided that the most effective way to protect the Government was through the procedures laid down in the act.

H.R. 1989, introduced by the chairman on January 9, 1959, amends the Summary Suspension Act of August 26, 1950, by defining the term "National Security" to mean all United States Government activities involving the national safety and security, including, but not limited to, activities concerned with the protection of the United States from internal subversion or foreign aggression. The bill also provides that all employees of any department or agency of the United States Government are deemed to be employed in an activity of the Government involving national security.

The committee is of the opinion that stopgap legislation is vital to the success of the Federal Loyalty Program and recommends the passage of H.R. 1989.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. THE PROBLEM OF FORMAL COMMUNIST PARTY MEMBERSHIP

The committee has learned, as the result of extensive investigation, that a plan is in operation by which members of the Communist Party go through the form of terminating technical membership, but remain adherents to the Communist Party and continue their Communist

Party activities. This is a Communist Party technique designed to evade Communist-control laws and to gain adherence among those who seek to operate with anonymity.

The committee is not ready to recommend specific legislation designed to solve this troublesome problem. It will continue its study of means by which Sections 4 and 5 of the Communist Control Act of 1954 may be amended to enlarge the definition of "membership" to include "affiliation."

2. INDUSTRIAL SECURITY

An important phase of over-all security in the United States is the right of a private corporation engaged in developing and producing for the Armed Forces goods involving secrets, to exclude from its premises persons not having security clearances. In the case of *Greene v. McElroy*, 360 U.S. 474 (1959), the Supreme Court held that regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Defense relating to this subject were without explicit authorization by either the President or Congress and, therefore, an employee lacking in such security clearance cannot be discharged as a security risk without according him the right of cross-examination and confrontation. It is vital to the national defense that legislation be enacted meeting all constitutional tests which will permit the Government to protect industry engaged in national defense without destroying its intelligence system in accomplishing that result.

Evidence has been received in committee hearings showing the purposeful planting of Communist Party members in private industry engaged in the production of highly important defense material. The lack of congressional or Presidential authority to establish an effective industrial security program constitutes a serious gap in the law pertaining to the national defense, and the committee recommends that immediate attention be given to this vital matter.

H.R. 3693 is illustrative of a number of bills introduced during 1959 relating to this subject. It authorizes the Federal Government to guard strategic defense facilities against individuals believed to be disposed to commit acts of espionage, sabotage, or other subversion.

The chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities introduced H.R. 8121 on July 7, 1959, specifically to overcome the decision in the *Greene* case. It was reported out by this committee on September 2, 1959, with the recommendation that the bill do pass, accompanied by Report No. 1122.

3. VESSELS AND PORT SECURITY

The Magnuson Act, 50 U.S.C. 191, 192, and 194, was enacted in 1950 during the Korean crisis. This Act authorized the President to promulgate rules and regulations to safeguard against destruction, loss, or injury from sabotage or other subversive acts, vessels, harbors, ports, and waterfront facilities. Pursuant to its provisions, there was established a system whereby persons who are security risks may be denied employment upon merchant ships.

The Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in the case of *Parker v. Lester*, 227 F. 2d 708 (1955), although recognizing that merchant seamen are in a sensitive position, in that the opportunities for serious sabotage are numerous, struck down the legislation on constitutional grounds. Granting that the Government may adopt appropriate means for excluding security risks from employment on

merchant vessels, it was held that this cannot be done by adopting a screening system which denies certain procedural requirements.

The committee believes that Congress can enact valid legislation protecting the public interest in this field and that the necessity for such legislation is clearly apparent. It recommends the enactment of legislation adopting a screening system which will meet constitutional tests without destroying the security program.

4. COMMUNIST LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

A special report issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1959 revealed that identified Communists and persons fronting for Communist-controlled organizations are engaged in accelerated operations as paid lobbyists in the Nation's Capital.

In keeping with the committee's views and recommendations, the chairman introduced H.R. 9054 on Sept. 3, 1959, to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to require certain additional information from persons required to register as lobbyists, including disclosure of Communist Party membership at any time since January 1, 1948.

The purpose of this bill is to require lobbyists for Red-dominated organizations to disclose this fact so that Members of the Congress can distinguish them from the representatives of legitimate organizations which retain lobbyists in Washington. The bill was referred to this committee late in the first session, and it is anticipated will be reported out during the second session.

5. ORDERS BY SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD FOR REGISTRATION MADE APPLICABLE TO SUCCESSOR ORGANIZATIONS

Investigations and hearings by the committee, as demonstrated in the section of this report dealing with Communist Training Operations, reveal Communist techniques of reorganizing under another name organizations required to register under the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950. To guard against this practice, the chairman of this committee introduced H.R. 8429 on July 28, 1959.

This bill, referred to the Committee on Un-American Activities, amends the Internal Security Act of 1950 to provide for a procedure under which certain final orders of the Subversive Activities Control Board with respect to Communist organizations may be made applicable to successor organizations. It was amended in committee, voted out as amended with the recommendation that it do pass, and was passed by the House on September 7, 1959. There has been no action by the Senate. Its approval is recommended.

6. LABELING OF FOREIGN COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

The chairman included in H.R. 2232, introduced by him on January 12, 1959, a section dealing with "Amendments of Foreign Agents Registration Act." The purpose of the amendments is to counteract more effectively Communist schemes and devices being used to avoid those prohibitions of the Act requiring labeling of Communist propaganda.

Investigations and hearings have continued through the 1st session of the 86th Congress in order that the committee may give further study and consideration to the involved problems relating to this subject.

INDEX

INDIVIDUALS

A

	Page
Abe, Yukio	127
Abt, John J.	75
Acevedo, Ramon	70
Agosto, Victor	70
Aiuppa (Joseph)	125
Alexander, Edwin A.	43, 122, 124
Andreu Iglesias, Cesar	72
Andrews, Robert T.	29
Angert, Bernard	43
Applegate, Robert	29, 30
Aptheker, Herbert	18, 60
Arbona Cuevas, Eugenio	72
Arroyo Zeppenfeldt, Manuel	71
Auslander (Jacob)	128

B

Bahrany, Ivan P.	98-101, 118
Barenblatt, Lloyd	122-126, 128
Barnes, Donald F.	67
Barsky (Edward K.)	128
Bart (Philip)	125, 128
Beal, Fred	61
Beria (Lavrenti)	103
Berman, Victor Michael	51
Bessie (Alvah)	128
Beverly, Leon	38
Biberman (Herbert)	128
Blauvelt, Mildred	67, 68, 71
Bowers (George L.)	125
Braden, Carl	123, 124
Bradley (Lyman R.)	128
Brewster (Frank W.)	125, 128
Bridges, Agnes (formerly Mrs. Harry Bridges)	44
Bridges, Harry (also known as Harry Dorgan)	44-46, 117
Briehl, Walter	122, 129
Brucker, Wilber M.	30
Bryan (Helen R.)	128
Budenz, Louis	11, 12, 31
Bulgadin, Nikolai	80
Burgos De Pagan, Consuelo	72
Buteneff, Sergei	67

C

Cantor, Esther	62
Carrion, Ramon Mirabal. (<i>See</i> Mirabal Carrion, Ramon.)	
Chamberlain, Neville	116
Chapman (Elvertton R.)	127
Chen, Jack	54, 55
Cheng, Samuel W. S.	96, 118
Chiang, Kai-shek	45
Chodorov (Marjorie)	128
Chou En-lai	80
Christianson (Judge)	127
Clark (Tom C.)	132

	Page
Clinger, Moisselle J.....	23, 24
Cole (Kendrick M.).....	132
Cole (Judge).....	127
Cole (Lester).....	128
Collins, Harold.....	59, 60
Colon, Jesus.....	68
Corales, Juan Saez. (See Saez Corales, Juan.)	
Corretjer, Juan Antonio.....	72
Crenovich, Michael.....	68
Criley, Richard.....	42
Cruz, Ramon Diaz. (See Diaz Cruz, Ramon.)	
Cuesta, Jose Enamorado. (See Enamorado Cuesta, Jose.)	
Cuevas, Eugenio Arbona. (See Arbona Cuevas, Eugenio.)	
Curran (Edward M.).....	128
Cvetic, Matthew.....	27, 31

D

Davis, Horace Chandler.....	122, 123, 128
Davis, William E.....	124
Dayton (Weldon Bruce).....	129
Degras, Jane.....	15
Dency, Albert P.....	42, 43
Dennis (Eugene).....	128
De Pagan, Consuelo Burgos. (See Burgos De Pagan, Consuelo.)	
Deriabin, Petr S.....	20-22, 117
Deutch, Bernhard.....	124, 127
Devunich, Anna (Mrs. Stephen Devunich).....	28, 36
Devunich, Stephen.....	36
Diaz Cruz, Ramon.....	72
Dmytryk (Edward).....	128
Dobbs, Ben.....	77
Dobriansky, Lev.....	106, 118
Donner, Frank.....	31, 32
Dorgan, Harry. (See Bridges, Harry)	
Dovzhenko, Oleksander P.....	110
Dulles, Allen.....	16
Dulles, John Foster.....	122

E

Eaton, Cyrus.....	17
Eckert, Kenneth.....	64
Efross, Sidney T.....	51, 52
Eisenhower, Dwight D.....	8, 9, 15, 53, 56
Eisler, Gerhart.....	75, 125, 128
Ellis, Rachael Carter.....	40
Emmanuelli Morales, Juan.....	72
Emspak, Julius.....	31, 125, 128
Enamorado Cuesta, Jose.....	70, 71
Evergood, Philip.....	56

F

Fast (Howard).....	128
Feuerbach, Ludwig.....	89
Fields (Benjamin).....	127
Finkelstein, Sidney.....	62
Fishman, Irving.....	70
Flaxer (Abram).....	125, 127
Fleischman (Ernestina G.).....	128
Foreman, Clark.....	27, 28, 82
Friedman, Dorothy Ray.....	48

G

Garcia Rodriguez, Pablo Manuel.....	72
Gates, John.....	69
Gheorghiu-Dej, Gheorghe.....	80
Glazier, William.....	44
Gojack, John T.....	124, 128
Golden, Hamp.....	26-29, 31, 34, 36

	Page
Golden, Mary (Mrs. Hamp Golden).....	26-29, 34, 36
Gomulka, Wladyslaw.....	80
Gordon (Judge).....	127
Greene (William L.).....	133
Grossman, Aubrey W.....	75
Grossman (Saul).....	125, 128
Grumman, Frank.....	124
Grunewald, Henry.....	126

H

Hackney, John R.....	39-42
Haimowitz, Leonore.....	48, 49
Hall, Gus.....	5-8, 17-19
Hanes, John W., Jr.....	52, 53, 129
Hardin, R. J.....	29
Harlan (John M.).....	123
Hartman, Louis Earl.....	124
Hawes, John Peter.....	72
Hayes, Charles A.....	40
Haywood, Harry.....	69
Healey, Dorothy (Ray).....	77, 79
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich.....	89
Hiskey, Clarence.....	126, 127
Hitler, Adolph.....	87, 101, 116
Hitz, William, Jr.....	124
Hitz, William, Sr.....	127
Ho Chi Minh.....	80
Holtzoff (Alexander).....	127, 128
Hoxha, Enver.....	80

I

Iglesias, Cesar Andreu. (<i>See</i> Andreu Iglesias, Cesar.).....	
Ingerman, Herbert.....	124

J

Jackson, James E., Jr.....	57, 131
Jencks, Clinton Edward.....	64, 65, 117
Johnson, Arnold.....	66, 67, 117
Josephson, Leon.....	61, 75
Justiz (Harry M.).....	128

K

Kadar, Janos.....	80
Kaganovich, Lazar.....	102, 103
Kahn, Arthur David.....	49, 50
Kamp (Joseph).....	128
Katzen, Leon.....	42
Keech (Richmond B.).....	128
Keeney, Mary Jane.....	125, 126
Kemenovich, Katherine (Mrs. Vincent Kemenovich).....	35, 36
Kemenovich, Vincent.....	34, 35
Kent, Rockwell.....	122, 129
Kent (W. Wallace).....	123
Khrushchev, Nikita.....	2, 8-10, 12-17, 19-21, 66, 80, 98-116
Kim Il Sung.....	80
Kiraly, Bela.....	110-113, 118
Kirkland (James R.).....	128
Kirkwood, Robert C.....	32
Klein, Henry.....	62
Knight (Frances G.).....	50
Knowles (Mary).....	128
Konev (Ivan).....	80
Kononenko, Constantin.....	118
Kostiuk, Gregory.....	109, 118
Kovago, Joseph.....	110, 111, 113, 118
Kudriavtsev, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich.....	22
Kyung Rai Kim.....	96, 97, 118

	L	Page
LaPoma (Nugent).....		125
Lardner (Ring, Jr.).....		128
Lawrynenko, Jurij.....	109, 110,	118
Lawson (John Howard).....		128
Lebed, Mykola.....	108, 109,	118
Lee Chang Whan.....		97
Lehrer, Robert.....		124
Leider (Ruth).....		128
Lenin, V. I.....	11, 12, 15, 37, 56, 83,	88-91
Lester (J. A.).....		133
Letts (F. Dickinson).....		128
Levins, Richard (J.).....		68
Lewis, John.....		41
Liu, Tsin-tsai.....	95, 96,	118
Liveright (Herman).....		128
Lombardo Toledano, Vicente.....		80
Lubchenko (Panas).....		109
Lumer, Hyman.....		57, 61
Lustig (James).....		128
Lyons, Eugene.....	101-105,	118

M

Magana (Manuel).....		128
Malenkov, Georgi.....	15,	103
Maletcr, Pal.....	103,	113
Malinin, Ivan M.....	107,	118
Malis, Victor.....		124
Maltz (Albert).....		128
Mao Tse-tung.....	80,	93
Marcello (Carlos).....		125
Marino, Armando. (<i>See</i> Torres, Angel Rene.)		
Marron, Wee Willie. (<i>See</i> Norman, William.)		
Marron, William Norman. (<i>See</i> Norman, William.)		
Marshall (George).....		128
Martin, Diego L.....		72
Martinez, Eusebio Ruiz. (<i>See</i> Ruiz, Frank.)		
Marx, Karl.....	79, 80, 88-90,	118
Masens, Vilis.....	114, 115,	118
Matles, James J.....		31
Matthews (Burnita Shelton).....	127,	128
Maysonet-Hernandez, Jorge W.....		70
Melendez Perez, Gertrudis.....		72
Mendez, Cristino Perez. (<i>See</i> Perez Mendez, Cristino.)		
Meyer, Frank S.....	58,	59
Mikoyan (Anastas I.).....		112
Millard, Elizabeth Boynton.....		52
Miller (Arthur).....		125
Miller (Louis).....		128
Miller, Marion.....	23-26	
Mirabal Carrion, Ramon.....		72
Mircheff, Bocho.....		48
Molotov (V. M.).....		103
Moore (George H.).....		128
Morales, Juan Emmanuelli. (<i>See</i> Emmanuelli Morales, Juan.)		
Morford (Richard).....		128
Morris (James Ward).....		128
Muller, Fred Paul.....		48

Mc

McBain, Francis William.....		43
McClellan, Richard W.....		32
McElroy (Neil H.).....		133
McNeil, James Allan Donald.....		36

N

Nagy, Imre.....		103
Nelson, Carl.....		37-42
Nelson, John W.....		31, 32

	Page
Nelson, Steve.....	36, 130
Niemeyer, Gerhart.....	87
Nikolai, Archbishop Dorofeyevich Yarushevich.....	21
Norman, William (also known as Wee Willie Marron; born William Norman Marron).....	68
Nowacki, Casimir T.....	47
Nowak, Stanley.....	49

O

O'Connor, Harvey.....	124, 125
O'Connor, Roderic.....	50
Ojeda Ruiz, Felix.....	70
O'Mara, Timothy.....	126, 127
Orear, Leslie.....	38
Ornitz (Samuel).....	128

P

Parker (Lawrence E.).....	133
Parks, Samuel J., Jr.....	100
Pasternak, Boris.....	100
Patterson, William Lorenzo.....	46, 47, 68
Pavlovych, Petro (born Apollon Trembow).....	107, 118
Penha, Armando.....	48
Peoples, Frank.....	51
Perez, Gertrudis Melendez. (<i>See Melendez Perez, Gertrudis.</i>).....	72
Perez Mendez, Cristino.....	50
Perlo, Victor.....	72
Philbrick, Herbert.....	128
Pine (David A.).....	93, 94, 118
Pong, Peter Chu.....	50, 51, 122, 124
Popper, Martin.....	125
Poretto (Joseph).....	29, 30
Port, A. Tyler.....	41, 42
Poskonka, Joseph A.....	11, 14, 17, 90-93, 118
Possony, Stefan T.....	61
Potash, Irving.....	23
Poulson, Harper.....	80
Prestes, Luis Carlos.....	128
Price (William A.).....	41, 42
Proctor, Charles.....	42
Prosten, Jesse E.....	107, 108, 118
Prychodko, Nicholas.....	

Q

Quinn, Thomas J.....	31, 125, 128
----------------------	--------------

R

Rakosi, Alex Roth.....	35, 36
Reichard, Richard Wilson.....	63
Reshetar, John S., Jr.....	87
Riasnyv.....	108
Riemer, Mortimer.....	51
Rivera, Juan Santos. (<i>See Santos Rivera, Juan.</i>).....	
Rizley (Ross).....	128
Rodriguez, Pablo M. Garcia. (<i>See Garcia Rodriguez, Pablo Manuel.</i>).....	69, 70
Roman, Armando.....	28
Rudiak, Joseph.....	
Ruiz, Felix Ojeda. (<i>See Ojeda Ruiz, Felix.</i>).....	72
Ruiz, Frank (also known as Eusebio Ruiz Martinez).....	
Ruiz Martinez, Eusebio. (<i>See Ruiz, Frank.</i>).....	125
Rumely, Edward A.....	127
Russell (Harry).....	124
Russell, Norton Anthony.....	

	Page
S	
Sacher (Harry).....	125, 128
Saez Corales, Juan.....	72
Samter, Alfred James.....	124
Santiago, Jose.....	70
Santos Rivera, Juan.....	72
Scherer, Gordon H.....	30
Schlesinger, Hymen.....	27
Schmidt, Viola.....	28
Schultz, Miriam.....	28
Scott (Adrian).....	128
Seeger, Peter.....	124
Serov (Ivan A.).....	112
Shahn, Ben.....	55, 56
Shelton (Robert).....	128
Sidzikauskas, Vaclovas.....	114-116, 118
Silber, Bernard.....	124
Silva, Adele Kronick.....	23
Sinclair (Harry E.).....	127
Singer (Marcus).....	125
Sipes, John W.....	52
Sirica (John J.).....	128
Slipyi, Metropolitan Josef.....	108
Small, Jack.....	30
Smith, Donald H.....	42
Southey, Jack.....	38
Staber, Alexander.....	28
Stalin, Josef.....	15, 79, 98-103, 106, 110, 114, 115
Steinberg, Alex.....	29
Steinberg, Esther (Mrs. Alex Steinberg).....	28
Stern (Charlotte).....	128
Stern, Meyer.....	40
Sullivan, Elliott.....	124
Suslov (Mikhail Andreevich).....	112

T

Thorez, Maurice.....	80
Tito (Josip Broz).....	80
Togliatti, Palmiro.....	80
Tokunaga, Ralph.....	127
Torres, Angel René (also known as Armando Marino).....	69, 70
Townsend (Francis E.).....	125, 127
Trembow, Apollon. (See Pavlovych, Petro.).....	
Trumbo (Dalton).....	128
Turner, Leo.....	41
Turoff, Sidney.....	124
Tyne, George.....	124

U

Ulbricht, Walter.....	80
Unger, Abraham.....	75
Uphaus (Willard).....	130

W

Wailles, Gloria.....	38
Wang, Shih-ping.....	94, 95, 118
Warren (Earl).....	123
Warren, Susan.....	62, 63
Watkins (John T.).....	123, 125
Watson, Goldie.....	124
Weinstock, Louis.....	63
Weise, Myer.....	60, 61
Weiss, Max.....	13
Weiss, Stanley L.....	68
Wheeldin, Donald.....	124
Wilkinson, Frank.....	123, 124
Williams, Wheeler.....	53-55
Witt, Nathan.....	75

	Page
Wowchuk, Ivan-----	109, 118
Wright, Frank-----	55
Wright, Thomas B.-----	31
Wyman (Louis C.)-----	130

Y

Yates (Oleta O'Connor)-----	130, 131
Yellin, Edward-----	124
Young (Philip)-----	132

Z

Zabritski, Joseph-----	39
Zakharov, N. S.-----	115
Zeppenfeldt, Manuel Arroyo. (See Arroyo Zeppenfeldt, Manuel.)	
Zhukov (Georgi)-----	80, 103

ORGANIZATIONS

A

Adelphi Hall-----	59, 62
All-Pacific and Asian Dockworkers' Trade Union Conference, First, May 11-13, 1959, Tokyo, Japan-----	44
All-Union Soviet Writers Congress, Third; May 18-23, 1959, Moscow-----	100
American Artists Professional League-----	53, 55
American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born-----	28, 29
American Communications Association-----	30
American National Exhibition (July 25-September 5, 1959, Moscow)---	53, 101
American Russian Institute of Southern California-----	78
American-Russian Trading Corp. (Amtorg)-----	21
American Society of Travel Agents-----	85
Amtorg. (See American-Russian Trading Corp.)	
Assembly of Captive European Nations-----	111
Latvian delegation to-----	114
Lithuanian delegation to-----	114

C

CARE-----	84-86
Chicago Committee to Defend Democratic Rights-----	42
Chin Ling Theological Seminary-----	95, 96
Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms-----	78
Committee for a Free Lithuania-----	114
Committee for Constitutional Government-----	125
Communist International. (See International, III.)	
Communist Party, Great Britain:	
Central Committee-----	58
Student Bureau-----	58
Communist Party, Hungary-----	111
Communist Party, Puerto Rico-----	70, 72
Central Committee-----	72
San Juan, Municipal Committee-----	70, 72
Third National Assembly-----	68
Communist Party, Soviet Union:	
Central Committee-----	102
Politburo-----	102
Twentieth Congress, February 1956-----	16, 115
Twenty-first Congress, January 1959-----	16
Communist Party, Ukraine-----	102, 107
Central Committee-----	109
Communist Party, U.S.A.-----	5-10, 13-15, 19, 66
National structure:	
National Committee-----	11, 18, 67, 78, 79
National Executive Committee-----	8, 18
National Conference, December 1955-----	13
National Review Commission-----	68
Seventeenth National Convention, December 1959-----	5-8, 17, 18
Sixteenth National Convention, February 1957, New York City--	70

Communist Party, U.S.A.—Continued

District organization:	Page
District 8 (Illinois and Indiana)	58
District 13	77
Northern California District	77
Southern California District	22, 77-79
Convention, April 13-14, 1957, Los Angeles	78
District Council	77, 78
Executive Board	77
Western Section	23
Youth Commission	78
State organization:	
Colorado:	
Boulder, University of Colorado, Student Branch	51
Illinois:	
Chicago:	
Packinghouse Section, Section Committee	42
South Side Section Committee	58
Massachusetts, Boston	72
Harvard University student unit	63
Second Harvard College Undergraduate Branch	63
New York State:	
Industrial Section	62
New York County Committee	62
State Committee	62, 69
Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh:	
North Side Club	26

D

Dockworkers' Trade Union Conference, First All-Pacific and Asian. (See All-Pacific and Asian Dockworkers' Trade Union Conference.)	
Downtown Club	78

E

Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, United	30, 31, 83
District 6	31
Local 506	31, 32
Local 601	31
Local 610	32
Emergency Civil Liberties Committee	27, 28, 82, 83, 124

F

Faculty of Social Science	57-63, 67, 68
First All-Pacific and Asian Dockworkers' Trade Union Conference. (See All-Pacific and Asian Dockworkers' Trade Union Conference.)	

G

General Electric Co.	32
Erie, Pa., plant	31

H

Harvard University	63, 123
Housewives Price Protest Committee	28
Housewives Protest Committee	28
Hungarian Committee	111
Hungarian Freedom Fighters Federation, Inc.	111

I

Independent Voters League	28
Institute for American Strategy	1
International, III	83
Seventh World Congress, July 25 to August 20, 1935, Moscow	90
International Congress of Lawyers (1946, Paris, France)	51
International Workers Order	62
Intourist, Inc.	21, 85

J

Jefferson School of Social Science	57-63, 67, 70
Marxist-Leninist Institute Committee	59
John Reed Club, School of Art	55

L

	Page
Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, International.....	44, 83
Los Angeles Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.....	25, 78

M

Machinists, International Association of.....	43
MARS (Workshop of the Revolutionary Word).....	98
Marxist Forums.....	57, 62, 63
Marxist-Leninist Caucus.....	69
Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, Amalgamated....	39
Metropolitan Music School, Inc.....	62
Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, International Union of.....	64, 83
District 2.....	64

N

National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.....	82
National Lawyers Guild.....	51, 122
National War College.....	1
Nationality Committee of Western Pennsylvania.....	28
North Side Peace Club (Pittsburgh).....	28

P

Packinghouse Labor and Community Center.....	42
Packinghouse Workers of America, United.....	38, 41, 42
District 1.....	38, 40
District 6.....	40
Local 25.....	39
Local 28.....	41, 42
Provisional Organizing Committee for a Marxist-Leninist Communist	
Party (also known as POC).....	69, 70

R

Reserve Officers Association.....	1
-----------------------------------	---

S

School for Democracy.....	60
Shanghai China Theological Seminary.....	96
Southern Conference for Human Welfare.....	82
Soviet Association of Friendship and Cultural Cooperation With the Coun-	
tries of Latin America.....	67, 70, 71

T

Tass News Agency.....	21
Trade Union Service, Inc.....	31

U

Ukrainian Catholic Church.....	106
Ukrainian Commission To Investigate the Vinnitsa Killings.....	107
Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.....	106
Ukrainian Insurgent Army.....	106, 108
Ukrainian National Rada.....	98
Ukrainian Orthodox Autocephalic Church.....	106, 108
Ukrainian Relief Committee (Innsbruck, Austria).....	99
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Government of:	
Ministry of War (Army):	
GRU (military intelligence).....	22
Secret Police:	
Guard Directorate (also known as Okhrana).....	20, 21
KGB.....	20-22
MGB.....	20, 21
MVD.....	20
NKVD.....	107, 108, 115
Union of Writers of Ukraine.....	99

United States Government:	Page
Department of Agriculture.....	75
Department of Defense.....	29, 30
Department of State.....	52
National Labor Relations Board.....	75
Office of Strategic Services (OSS).....	49
Office of War Information.....	56
Resettlement Administration.....	56
Supreme Court.....	123-125, 128-133
U.S. Information Agency.....	56
University of California.....	64
University of Michigan.....	123
University of Pennsylvania, Foreign Policy Research Institute.....	1

W

Westinghouse Electric Corp.....	31
Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation.....	64
Workers Schools:	
Chicago.....	58
New York.....	60, 63
World Tourists, Inc.....	85
World Youth Festival, Second; August 1949, Budapest.....	51

Y

Young Communist League.....	43, 63
-----------------------------	--------

PUBLICATIONS

Congress and Your Rights (bulletin).....	82
Daily Worker.....	11
Dispatcher, The.....	44
Doctor Zhivago (book).....	100
La Paz.....	72
Literary Gazette, The (Literaturna Hazeta).....	99
Masses and Mainstream.....	56
Packinghouse Worker, The.....	38
Political Affairs.....	13, 60
Pueblo.....	70-72
U.E. News.....	31
Vanguard.....	69-72
Worker, The.....	46

